SCS #1338

The Divine Right of Church Government and Excommunication &c.

By Mr. Samuel Rutherford Professor of Divinity St. Andrews

London. Printed in the year 1648.

S.C.S. #1338

Liber Mr. Fraser. 1743.

TO

The Right Honorable and Noble Lord,

The EARL of

LOVDEN,

Chancellor of *Scotland*;

AND

Chancellor of the University of St. *Andrews*,

Grace, Mercy and Peace.

RIGHT HONORABLE,

AS Jesus Christ the wonderful, the Counsellor, the mighty God *driveth on his great State-design in the whole Earth, and now in these Kingdoms,* to save an afflicted people, to dye his Garments in the blood *of his Enemies, and to* Isa. 9. 6.

build
505 #133

build the Tabernacle of God amongſt men, *and*
Iſa. 35. 1, 2. cauſe the wildernes bloſſome as a Roſe, *that* the glory of Lebanon, and the excellency of Carmel and Sharon *may in a ſpiritual manner be given to* Zion; *So he ſtill acteth in his own ſphere of Righteouſnes, and all inferior wheels in their revolutions move toward his moſt eminent end; for the Courtiers and Royal Attendants of his Throne are* Righteouſnes *and* Judgement. *And he deſireth that the motions and wayes of his people may be concentrick to his own heart, and move in the ſame Orb with himſelf; we muſt either walk, or be drawn to the end of* Jeſus Chriſt, *his end cannot come down and comply with our policy. When men go with one head, and two faces, and two hearts, Providence can beguil them: we are then ſafe, and do ſail at the Haven of the Sea when we walk with God, and our way draweth a ſtraight line to the heart of* Jeſus Chriſt. *Theſe two Kingdoms have before them an end, the Covenant to be a people to God; this we did* Swear with our Hands lifted up to the moſt High; *the ſtones of the field ſhall witnes againſt us, and the* Sword of the Lord avenge the quarrel of his Covenant, *if we dally with the Lord, as if the Vow of God, that the* Lord may be one, and his Name

Pſal. 97. 1.

Vel lubentes, vel vi attracti decreta Dei ſe quamur neceſſe eſt.

one in both Kingdoms *had been on us, when we were low only, and our Oath had a date only till the Year* 1645. *and then our Vow must exspire, as did the Law of shaddows, when the Body* Jesus Christ *came. As successe is a poor and waxy* Kalender *for Religion, so the low condition of our Kingdom, I hope, shall not move us to forsake the Lords cause, or to blame God, because* good causes have sometimes sad events; *for beside that* Heathens *said, that* God cannot erre, *because* Marius ex culpâ gloriam reportavit, *Marius was made glorious by ill-doing, and* one hath a Crosse, another a Kings Crown for a reward of wickedneſſe, *we know that God,* however it be, is good to Israel. *If that which was intended for Vnion, shall by mens wickedneſſe, turn to a sad Division between the Kingdoms, I shall believe, that the truly Godly of either Kingdoms, can scarce be capable of such bloody intentions, as shall leave a Legacy of perpetuated blood to the Posterity; and sure, though for the present guiltinesse, strength prevail, yet* habent Deum ultorem, *men on Earth cannot long be strong against Vengeance from Heaven. As successe doth inebriate, so extremity of a low condition is a wicked Counsellor; and evil Iealousie, as Hell, thinketh alwayes evil. All whose*

Ille crucem sceleris pretium tulit, hic diadema. Iuven. Saty. 10.

bowels

bowels are moved for the Desolation, Graves, multiplied Widows and Orphans of both Kingdoms will not dare (Judgement from the Almighty being a terrour to them) *to adde affliction to the people of God already afflicted. Blessed shall they be of the Lord, who mediate for preventing of National ruptures, and for the continuance of the Brotherly Covenant.* Christ Jesus *is a uniting Saviour,* one God, one Faith, one Lord Jesus, *one Religion should be, and I beseech the* God of Peace, *they may be Chains of Gold to tie these two* Nations *and* Churches *together* in uno tertio, *that they may be concentered and united in one* Lord Jesus. *O that that precious* Dew of Hermon, *that showers of Love and Peace may lie all the night upon the Branches of the* two Olive Trees, *that the warmnesse, heat, and influence of one Sun of Righteousnesse with healing in his wings, may make the* Lilly amongst the Thorns, the Rose of Sharon, *that is planted by the Lord, the Spouse of* Jesus Christ *in both Kingdoms to* spred its Root, *and* cast its Smell, *as green and flourishing to all the Nations round about. The Kingdom of* God *is Peace. The* Lord *is about a great work in* Britain, *why should Divisions that proceed from the lusts of men, and the* enemies of the Lord *re-*

tard the wheels of the Chariot of Christ? *Let us not water the Lilly with blood again. The* Sons of Babel *have shed our blood in great abundance, for the which doth the Church of* God *in the three Kingdoms stand, and Pray and Prophecy in sackcloth.* The violence done to me and to my flesh be upon *Babylon*, shall the Inhabitants of *Zion* say: And my blood upon the Woman arrayed in Purple and Scarlet, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth, shall *Ierusalem* say. *Happy we, if we could see the second Temple builded, and the* Lord *repairing the old waste places, and the* Gentiles beholding the Righteousnesse *of the Elder Sister the* Church of the Jews, *and both as a* Crown of Glory in the hand of the Lord, and as a Royal Diadem in the hand of our God.

Ier. 51.35.

Rev 17.3. 5.

Isa.62.1,2.

I shall not need, I hope, either of an Apology for Intituling this Piece, such as it is, (*others can, and I hope will adde riper Animadversions to* Erastus) *to Your Honours Name, or of a word of incitement, that Your Lordship co-operate with Your serious Endeavours, for a right understanding between both Kingdoms, and for the carrying on the work of the right arm of the* Lord,

the

the Lords *creating of* glory on every Assembly on Mount *Zion*, (*for we are witnesses of Your Honours Travels for both*) that glory may dwell in our Land.

Your Honours at all
respective obser-
vance in the Lord,

S. R.

To

To the Ingenuous and Equitable Reader.

IT lieth obvious to any ordinary underſtanding (worthy *Reader*) that as alwayes we ſee a little portion of God; ſo now, the *Lord our God* in his acting on *Kingdoms* and *Churches*, maketh *Darkneſſe his Pavilion*, to finde out the *Ni ôn* and the Demonſtrative Cauſes and true Principles of ſuch bloody concluſions and horrible vaſtations, as the Soveraign Majeſty of Heaven and Earth hath made in *Germany*, *Bohemiah*, and the *Palatinate*, as if they were greater ſinners then we are; and why the windows of Divine Juſtice have been opened to ſend down ſuch a deluge of blood on *Ireland*; and why in *Scotland* the Peſtilence hath *deſtroyed in the City*, and *the Sword of the Lord*, not a few in the fields, (their Lovers and Friends ſtanding aloof from their calamities) is from the *Lord who is wonderful in Counſel*; but to finde reaſons to quiet the underſtanding, is not an eaſie ſcrutiny: matters are rolled on inviſible wheels. It is enough to us no *Men*, no *Angels* can hunt out the tracings of Divine Providence; Nor can we ſet a day of Law, nor erect a Court to implead this *Lord*, who is not holden in Law, to anſwer for any of his matters: It were our wiſdom to acknowledge that the actions of our Lord, *ad extrà*, are ſo twiſted and interwoven thred over thred, that we can ſee but little of the walls and out-works of his unſearchable

Iob 37.23. שדי לא־מצאנהו Iob 33.13.

counsels; sure, Divine Providence hath now many irons in one fire, and with one touch of his finger he stirreth all the wheels in Heaven and Earth.

I speak this, if happily this little piece may cast it self in the eye of the Noble and Celebrious *Judges* and *Senators* who now sit at the Helm; for I hope they consider, it is but a short and sorry Line, or rather a poor Circle, *Job* 1. 21. *Gen.* 3. 19. between the Womb and the Grave, between Dust and Dust; and that they then act most like themselves (*Psal.* 82. 6. *I have said ye are Gods*) when they remember they are sinful men, and when they reckon it for gain, that the *King of Ages* gives them a Diurnal of 24 hours to build the House of the Lord, to cause the heart of a *Widow* Church (though her Husband live for evermore) *to sing for joy, and are eyes to the blinde, and legs to the lame*; and withall do minde, that when the Spirit is within half a Cubit, or the sixth part of a Span to Eternity, and Death cannot adjourn for six hours, to repent, or do any more service to Christ in the body, the welcom and testimony of God, shall be incomparably above the *Hosanna's* of men. Undeniable it is, that we destroy again what we have builded, if we behead the *Pope*, and divest him of his Vicarious Supremacy, and loader the *Man of Sins head*, in the Ecclesiastical Government, to the shoulders of any *Man*, or *Society* of men on Earth. It is not an enriching spoyl to pluck a Rose or Flower from the Crown of the Prince of the Kings of the Earth. *Diamonds* and *Rubies* picked out of the Royal Diadem of *Jesus Christ*, addeth but a poor and sorry Lustre to Earthly Supremacy; it is *Baldnesse in stead of Beauty.*

An Arbitrary power in any, whether in Prince or Prelats, is intolerable. Now to cast out Domination in one,

and

and to take it in in another, is not to *put away the Evil of our doings*, but to Barter and Exchange one sin with another, and mockingly to expiate the Obligation of one Arrear to God, by contracting new Debt. Again, how glorious is it, that *Shields of the Earth* lay all their Royalty and Power level with the dust *before him that sitteth on the Throne*, and to make their Highnesse but a Scaffold to heighten the Throne of the Son of God? Yea, if Domination by the Sword be the *Magistrates* Birth-right, as the Word of Truth teacheth us, *Luke* 22. 25, 26. *Psal.* 82. 1,6. *Rom.* 13. 4. and the Sword can never draw blood of the Conscience; It is evident that the *Lord Jesus* alloweth not Carnal weapons to be used within the walls of his Spiritual Kingdom; and if Power be an enchanting Witch, and like strong Drink, which is *dolosus luctator*, a cosening Wrestler, we are to be the more cautelous and circumspect, that it incroach not upon *Jesus Christ*, for fear that we *provoke the eyes of his glory*, and cause *Jerusalem to be plowed, and Zion become heaps*, and *many houses great and fair, desolate.*

Let the Appeal be to the *Spirit that speaketh to the Churches* in the Word: The Golden Reed can measure every Cubit of the Temple; as well the outer Porch, as *the Holy of Holiest*, and all the dimensions, the *length and bredth of the City which is named* יהוה שמה *The Lord is there.* If the *Scripture* be no Rule of *Church Government*, but the *Magistrates* Sword be upon the *shoulders of Christ*, as the prime *Magistrate*; we come too near to the Jewish, Earthly, and Temporary *Messiah.* And if Excommunication and Censures, and that Ministerial Governing which was undeniably in the Apostolick Church, be Fictions, we are in the dark. I confesse, we know not whether the Vessels of the House should be of Gold and

Silver, or if they should be but Earthen Pitchers.

It is said, *That all this is but a Plea for a Dominion of an higher Nature, even over the Consciences of men by Censures.* But why a Dominion? Because a power of Censures? Surely, if they were not Spiritual Censures, and such as hath influence on the Conscience, we should yield a Domination were the businesse. But this power of Censuring Spiritually, is as strong as Authoritative in Dispensing Rebukes, Threats, Gospel-charges and Commands in the Word Preached, as in Censures; The power is Ministerial only in the Word, not Lordly; and why should it be deemed a Dominion, and an Arbitrary power in the one, and not in the other?

If the will of the *Magistrate* may carve out any Government that seems good to him, and the Word of God in this plea be laid aside, as perfect in Doctrine, but imperfect and useless in Government, we fall from the Cause. But if the Word of God stand as a Rule in matters of Church-Government; then the Question is only, on whose shoulders the *Ark* should be carried; and by whose Ministery doth *Jesus the Lord* and *King* of the House punish (if I may use this word) Scandalous men? And whether doth the Head of the *Church Christ, in laying Judgement to the Line, and Righteousnesse to the Plummet,* use the *Magistrates* Sword for a Spiritual and Supernatural end of the Service and Ministery of his Church; or doth he send Pastors and Teachers as his Ambassadors for this end? *But if you were not Disputing your self, and not Christ* (say some) *to make Preachers the Alpha and Omega of mens Consciences, and the Circle which beginneth and endeth at it self, you would be satisfied, if Scandals be punished by the Magistrate: Is not the Magistrate a Christian as you are?* Paul *was glad*

that

that the Gospel was Preached, he made no account by whom. But I should be grieved that such a hard conclusion should be drawn out of such innocent Principles: This were to extract Blood out of Milk, a *Domination* out of a meer *Ministery*; and I confesse, *Self* is a great Sophist in Debates, and that any man is inclinable to miscount himself, and to think he may stand for an hundred, when the product is scarce one, if not a cypher. I conceive nothing is here taught, that may reach a blow to the Honour and Majesty of the *Godly Magistrate.* The *Magistrate* is a *Christian* as well as the *Preacher*; and in some sense, so all *the People were holy, as were Moses, Aaron* and the *Levites. Uzziah* who burned Incense was a Member of the *Church of the Jews*, and Circumcised no lesse then the Sons of *Aaron*: Yet I hope these stretched themselves beyond their line, when they usurped what was due to the *Priests* and *Levites.* Its another thing to punish evil doing with the Sword, the Magistrate is to do this. But there is a Spiritual removing of Scandals, by *the saving of the Spirit in the day of the Lord*, 1 Cor. 5. 5. Matth. 18. 15. 2 Cor. 10. 8. and a gaining of the Soul of an Offender. This Spiritual removing of Scandals, doth only bring Christ and the Gospel in request, in the hearts of both such as are within and without the Church; as Scandals raiseth up an evil report of *Christ* and the *Truth.* Now the Sword can never this way remove Scandals; and because Christ hath appointed Spiritual means, and Spiritual Censures, to restore the *Lord Jesus* to his Honour, 2 *Cor.* 2. It is presumption (with all submission I speak it) for men to horse out, and decourt such Censures Spiritual as the Apostles in the Spirit and Wisdom of Christ used as most sutable to that end, and which the Lord commandeth in the second Command, and to substitute

in

in their room, nothing but a Sword void of all activity on the Conſcience.

I do alſo here plead for the perfection of the Word of God againſt Humane Ceremonies, which are deſervedly by the Honorable Houſes of Parliament, and Reverend Aſſembly laid aſide; *Religion* needeth not any ſuch Ornaments, except men would make the Worſhip of God, when naked, under ſhame, and ſo under ſin (for Juſtice Married ſhame and ſin once.) But as Roſes, Lillies, the Sun, and other glorious Creatures, are moſt beautiful without Garments, and not capable of ſhame; ſo is the Worſhip of God. I confeſſe, Ceremonies were the Seas and Rivers that Prelats delighted to ſwim in; and if their Element be dried up, they have the leſſe pleaſure to live: But if they would repent of their bloody Perſecution, that their Souls might be ſaved, no matter. Ceremonies, as they have nothing of Chriſt in them, ſo have they been injurious to Magiſtrates. It is but a Ceremony that the Emperour kiſſe the ſole of the Popes foot, becauſe there is indented on it a curious Crucifix. And when Prelacy was yong, and its beard not grown, a Deacon was ſent to *Theodoſius* the Emperor by the Prelats to chide him, becauſe he preſumed to ſit in the *Chancel*, a place too holy for Lay-men.

What I have here ſaid againſt *Eraſtus*, a friend too dear to worthy *Bullinger* and *Rodolp. Gualther*, (often we love both the Friend and his Error) I humbly ſubmit to the Judgement of the Godly and Learned: But I conceive, I am unwilling that Error ſhould lodge with me willingly; and I profeſſe I am afraid, that wrath is gone out from the Lord againſt the Rulers, if they ſhall after a Reformation obtained with the Lives, Blood, Tears and Prayers of ſo many of the Saints, whereof a great number

ber are aſleep in the Lord, rear up a building to the Lord ſo maimed and lame, as *Jeſus Chriſt* ſhall ſay, *Offer it now to your Governour, will he be pleaſed with you, or accept your perſons?* Mal. 1.

But it is a Controverſie (ſay ſome) *whether the Government of the Church of the New-Teſtament belong to the Magiſtrate or to the Church?* to which I ſay; 1. It was a Controverſie created by men willing to pleaſe Princes, with more power in the Courts of Chriſt, then ever the *Lawgiver* and *Apoſtles* gave them, and that againſt the minde of glorious Lights, the firſt Reformers, and the whole Troops of *Proteſtant Divines*, who Studied the Controverſie againſt the uſurped Monarchy of the Man of ſin, more exactly then one Phyſitian, who in a curſory way, diverted off his road of Medicine of which he wrote Learnedly, and broke in on the By upon the deepeſt Polemicks of Divinity, and reached a Riders blow unawares to his friends. 2. In things doubtful, Conſcience hath refuge to the ſureſt ſide: Now its granted by all, and not controverted by any, That in the *Apoſtolick Church*, the Government of the Church of the *New Teſtament* was in the hands of *Apoſtles*, *Paſtors*, *Teachers*; and therefore Conſcience would ſway to that in which there can be no Error, except on ſuppoſal of abuſe; and Chriſtian Rulers would not do well to venture upon Eternity, Wrath, the Judgement to come, confiding on the poor Plea of an *Eraſtian* Diſtinction, to incroach upon the Prerogative Royal of *Jeſus Chriſt*. This very God of Peace build *Zion*, and make her an Habitation of Peace.

Yours in Jeſus Chriſt,

S. R.

BIBLIOTHECÆ
COLL. NOV.
EDINENSIS

A Table of the CONTENTS of the Book.

Introduction, SECT. 1.

CHrist hath not instituted a mutable Church-Government, *Page* 1,2
Some things moral, some things natural in Gods worship, *Ibid.*
Physical Circumstances are all easily known and numbred, p.2
Circumstances, and such and such Circumstances, p.3
Time and place of Ceremonies need not be proved by Scripture, as being supposed, p.4,5
1. Argument to prove, that the platform of Ch. govern. is not mutable at mens wil, p.7
The Script. way of teaching that indifferent things are alterable, is it self unalterable, p.8
2. Argument, p.9
The Scripture shall not teach when we sin, in Church-policy, when not, if the platform be alterable at mens will, *Ibid.*
There is no reason why some things positive are alterable in Ch.-policy, some not, p.10
3. Argument, *ibid.*
The place 1 *Tim.*6.13. touching the unviolable cōmand given to *Timothy* discussed, p.10,11,12
Pauls cloak of lesse consequence then Positions of policy, p.11
Widows, p.12

SECT. 2.

4. Argument, p.13
Christ is the head of the Church, even in the external policy thereof, p.13,14
A promise of pardon of sin made to the right use of the Keys, proveth Discipline to be a part of the Gospel, p.15,16
The will of Christ as King, is the rule of the Government of his house, p.17,18
Things of policy, because lesse weighty then the greater things of the Law, are not therefore alterable at the will of men, p.19,20
Order requireth not a Monarchical prelate, p.21,22
How the care & wisdom of Christ hath left an immutable platform of Discipline, p.22,23
Christ the onely immediate King, Head, and Law-giver of his Church, without any deputy heads or Vicars, p.24,25

SECT. 3.

5. Argument, p.26,27
Moses and *David* might not alter or devise any thing in Worship or Government, nor may the Church now, p.27,28
Two notes of Divinity ought to be in the New Testament-Ceremonials, as were in the Old, p.29,30
How *Moses* his doing all according to the patern, proveth an immutable platform. The Objections of Mr. *Hooker* and Mr. *Pryn* answered at length, p.30,31,32,33,34, &c.
Gods care to us leadeth us to think he hath given us a better guide the natural Reason in all morals of Church-Discipline, p.33,34
The occasional writing of things in Scripture, no reason why they are alterable, p.35,36
Papists pretend, as Formalists do, that things are not written in the Word, because of the various occurrences of providence, p.36,37
That there was no uniform platform of Government written in the time of *Moses* and the Apostles, is no Argument that there is none now, p.39,40
Fundamentals, because successively delivered, are not alterable, p.41,42
The Church of *Ierusalem*, as perfect in Doctrine and Discipline, is our patern, p.42,43
The indifferency of some things in the Apostolick Church, cannot infer that the Government is alterable, p.45,46
The Argument of *Moses* his doing all in the Tabernacle, to the least pin, according to special direction, further considered, p.47-50
The Ark of *Noah* proveth the same, *ib.*
Formalists acknowledge Additions to the Scripture, contrary to *Deut.* 4.2. & 12.32. the same way that Papists do, p.51,-56, &c.
Moses and Canonick Writers are not Law-givers under God, but Organs of God, in writing, and meer reporters of the Law of God, p.62,63
Papists say that the Church is limited in the making of Ceremonies, both in the matt-

and the number, and so do Formalists, p 62,63,64
Four wayes Positives are alterable, but by God onely, p.64
All things, never so small, are alike unalterable, if they be stamped with Gods authority, speaking in the Scripture, p.64,65
By what authority Canonical Additions of the Prophets and Apostles were added to the Books of *Moses*, p.65
Canonick Writers how immediately led by God, p 66
The Characters of Formalists Ceremonies & Papists Traditions one and the same, p.67
What is it to be contained in Scripture, and how far it maketh any thing lawful, according to *Hooker*, p.68
The Fathers teach, that all things are to be rejected that are not in Scripture, p.69,70
It derogateth nothing from the honour of *God*, in Scripture, that hee be consulted in the meanest things, p.70
How things are in Scripture, p.71
Some actions are supernaturally moral, some naturally or civilly moral, some mixt. p.72
Some habitual reference to Scripture is required in all our moral actions. p. 73
Works of Supererogation holden by *Hooker*, p. 77
Whether our obedience be resolved, in all Church policy, in *This saith the Lord in his Word*, or in *This saith the Church*. p.79
Two things in the external worship, 1. Substantials. 2. Accidentals or Circumstantials, p. 80

SECT. 5.

The question who should be judge of things necessary or indifferent, in Church-policy, not to purpose, in this question. p. 81,82, &c.

SECT. 6.

What are Honour, Praise, Glory, Reverence, Veneration, Devotion, Religion, Service, Worship, Love, Adoration. p.82,83,84,85
Two acts of Religion imperated and elicite. p. 83
Honouring of holy men is not worship, p 84
The Religious object with the act of reverencing, maketh adoration to be Religious; but a civil object, except the intention concurs, maketh not religious adoration of a civil object. p. 85, 86
What Worship is. p.86,87
Worship is an immediate honouring of God, but some worship honoureth him more immediately, some lesse. p. 87, 88
A twofold intention in worship. p.88,89
Uncovering the head is veneration, not adoration, p. 89
Consecration of Churches taken two wayes condemned. p.90
Master *Hookers* moral grounds of the holinesse of Temples, under the *N.T.* answered. p.92
The place 1 *Cor.* 11. *Have ye not houses to eat and drink in, &c.* maketh nothing for hallowing of Churches. p.93
Nor the place *Psa.* 74 8. p.94
The Synagogue not Gods house, as the Temple was. *ib.*

Question 1.

The negative argument from Scripture valid. p.95
Not to command is to forbid. p.96
How far *Davids* purpose to build the Temple was lawful. p 97
Of additions to the Word. p.98
Even perfecting additions of men are unlawful. p. 99
Every moral action is to be warranted by the Word. p.102
What is man's, in worship, is not lawful p.103
Not all actions in man, as actions of meer nature, of arts or trades of sciences, but only moral actions are regulated by Scripture. p. 104
Helps of faith, and the formal object of faith are different. p 105
What certitude of faith is required in all our actions of our daily conversation. p. 107
The Scripture a Warrant for the morality of our acts, of the second Table. p. 107
Many actions of the second Table are purely moral, all actions of the first Table are purely moral. p. 107, 108
What ever is beside the Word of God, in morals,

morals, is contrary to it. p. 109
The vanity of the perfection of Scriptures in Essentials, not in Accidentals. p. 110
Whatsoever is not of faith, how true, p. 110, 111
Doubting condemneth. p. 113
Papists say, the Scripture in general is perfect, but not in particulars, and so Formalists. p. 114
What is onely negative in Gods worship, cannot be commanded. *ibid.*
Opinion of sanctity and divine necessity, not essential to false-worship. *ibid.*
The distinction of worship, essential, and accidental, of Gods general and particular will, is to be rejected. p. 118, 119
The distinction of divine and apostolike traditions rejected. p. 125, 126
Circumstances not positive, religious observances, as ceremonies are. p. 127
Ceremonies usurpe essential properties of divine Ordinances. p. 128, 129, 130
We owe subjection of conscience collateral onely to Gods Ordinances. p. 135
The spirit worketh not with Ceremonies. p. 136
The place *Matth.* 15. concerning the traditions of the Elders, discussed. p. 137, 138
Ceremonies Magical. p. 141
If the third command shall enjoyn decency in general, then must it enjoyn this special decency, Crosse and Surplice. p. 141, 142
Iewish and Popish Ceremonies, are fruitlesse professions of unlawful worship. p. 142, 143
Whether the Ceremonies be Idolatry. p. 144
Of religious kneeling. *ibid.*
Four things in adoration. *ibid.*
Intention of worship, not essential to worship. p. 145
Religious bowing, of its nature, and not by mans arbitrary and free intention, signifieth divine adoration. p. 147, 148
Objections of *Swarez* contending, that intention of adoration is essential to adoration, removed. p. 148, 149
Of the Idolatrous worship of the Iews and Papists. p. 150
The relative expressiō of God in the creature, is no ground of adoring the creature, p. 151
The Iews beleeved not the Golden calf to be really God. p. 151, 152
The adoring of Images not forbidden by the Ceremonial law, but by the Moral law. p. 154
The evasions of *Bellarmine* and *Swarez* answered. p. 155
Papists did of old adore before, or at the presence of the Image, as a memorative signe and yet were Idolators. p. 158
Two sort of signes. *ibid.*
Divers evasions of Papists touching the adoring of Images. p. 161, 162, *seq.*
Swarez is not content at the hungry expressions of *Durandus, Mirandula, Hulcot,* in the worshipping of Images. p. 165, 166
The place *(worship at his footstool)* discussed, *Psal. 99,* *ibid.*
Prayer may as lawfully be given to the creature, as Adoration. p. 169, 170
Divers Fables touching Images. p. 179, 180
The original of Images, p. 181
Images not in the ancient Church, neither worshipped therein, p. 182, 183, 184, *&c.*
Vasquez will have all things to be adored. p. 190
Joan. de Lugo proveth the same by four Reasons. p. 191
Whether sitting or kneeling, be the most convenient and lawful gesture, in the act of receiving the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood. p. 192
Sitting the onely convenient and lawful gesture. p. 193
What is occasional in the first Supper. *ibid.*
Christ sate at the first Supper. p. 194, 195
Sitting a sign of our coheirship. p. 197, 198, 199
A signe of our coheirship may well consist with our inferiority in worshipping Christ. p. 198
Ceremonies fail against the Authority of Rulers. p. 201
Whether humane Laws binde the conscience, or not. p. 201, 202, *seq.*
How civil positive Laws binde not the conscience p. 202, 203
A twofold goodnesse. p. 207

The will of created Authority cannot create goodneſſe in things. p 204, 205
Humane Laws oblige onely in ſo far, as they agree with the Law of God. p.206
A twofold conſideration of Humane Laws. p. 208
How Rulers are ſubordinate to God in commanding. p. 209
Humane authority is not the neareſt, nor the inſtrumental cauſe of Laws. p.208, 209
A double obedience due to Rulers, *objective*, and *ſubjective*. p. 210
Objective obedience no more due to Rulers, then to equals. p 210,211
Falſe Rules of obedience to Rulers, propoſed by D. *Jackſon*, refuted. p. 212.
The goodneſſe of ſuppoſed obedience to Rulers, cannot countervalue the evil in the ſinful manner of doing, with a doubting conſcience. p. 214
Other arguments for the obligation of humane Laws anſwered. p.216
What it is to reſiſt to Ruler. p.217
Why men cannot make Laws that layeth a tie on the conſcience. p.219
That Chriſt hath a ſpiritual Kingdom, not onely in the power of Preaching, but alſo in the power of the Keys, by cenſures. p. 220
That there is ſuch a divine Ordinance as Excommunication. p. 223
Objections againſt Excommunication removed. p. 224
How we are to rebuke our Brother. p. 225
The Church, *Matth.* 18. is not the civil Sanedrim. p.226,227,229
How Heathen and Publicans were excluded from the Church. p. 230
Binding and looſing acts judicial, p.235,236
Excommunication is a divine Ordinance, proved by 1 *Cor.* 5., p.238,239, *&ſeq. fuſe.*
To deliver to Satan, is not miraculous killing, p.238, 239
The eſſentials of Excommunication, 1 *Cor.* 5. p.238, 239, *&c.*
Whether the Word doth warrant cenſures, and excluſion from the Seals? *ibid.*
Cutting off, not alwayes killing. p. 241
Moral ſcandals excluded men from holy things, amongſt the Iews. p. 243
The prophecy, *Ezek* 44 11, 12, *&c.* to be fulfilled under the New Teſtament. p.244,245
Ceremonial excluſion from holy things under the old, did typifie excluſion for moral uncleanneſſe under the N. Teſt. p.247,248
The Churches excluſion from the Seals declarative, non coactive by violence. *ibid.*
Cenſures applyed to ſome by name. *ibid.*
Eſchuing the ſociety of ſcandalous Church-members, muſt be a Church-cenſure, p.249
The hindering of *Jezabel* by preaching, not ſufficient. p.251
Debarring of the ſcandalous from the Seals, proved. p.252. *ſeq.*
It belongeth not to the Magiſtrate to debar from the Seals. p.253
Eraſtus againſt excluſion from the Sacraments refuted. p.253. *ſeq. fuſe.*
By *Eraſtus* his way, we cannot deny the Seals to a Turk. p.258,259
To exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven not one with Excommunication. p.260
Excommunication is no real ſeparation of one from Chriſts inviſible body. p.261,262,264.
Though Excommunication be onely declarative, yet its not empty. p.266
Putting out 1 *Cor.* 5. p.269
Whether *Eraſtus* doth prove, that none were excluded amongſt the Iews, for moral uncleanneſſe, from the holy things of God. p. 271
A twofold forgiveneſſe. p.273
All are invited to come to the Sacraments, but not that they come any way. p. 274
The queſtion whether all ſhould be admitted to the Lords Supper, perverted by *Eraſtus*. p.275
Two ſort of ſignes amongſt the Iews, ſome purely holy, ſome partly holy, partly neceſſary for the bodily life; the latter clean and unclean might eat, but not the former. p. 277
All are commanded to hear, but not to come to the Supper. p. 280

Whether

Whether *Erastus* doth justly deny Excommunication to be typified of Old. p.281
Ceremonial uncleanneſſe typified excluſion out of the viſible Church for ſcandals, not out of the Kingdom of Heaven, p 287,288
Legal uncleanneſſe was ſin, p. 289
The ſcope and ſenſe of *Matth.* 18. perverted by *Erastus*, p. 290
Our Saviour ſpeaketh of all, not of private or leſſer ſcandals onely, p. 291
By the word (Brother) is not meaned a Iew onely, *ib.*
Chriſts ſpeaking in the ſecond perſon, argueth not the privacy of the ſcandal, p. 294
A twofold forgiving, p.295
Chriſt ſpeaketh not of ſuch ſins as private men may forgive, as *Erastus* dreameth, p. 297
Chriſts ſcope ſpiritual, *Erastus* his way carnal, p.298
A Publican moſt odious to the Iews, p.305
Its not private forgiveneſſe which is holden forth, *Matth.* 18. 17. p. 308
Binding and looſing proper to Stewarts, p.309
To excommunicate is not formally to debar from the Seals, p. 311
Chriſt might well give directions touching a Church not yet erected, p. 314, *&c.*
The place 1 *Cor.* 5. vindicated from *Erastus* his gloſſe, p. 316, 317, *&c.*
The prayers of the Church intervene not for this particular miracle, p.318, 319
Faith of miracles not in all the faithful at *Corinth*, p. 320
Delivering to Satan not miraculous, p.321
The Church, not *Paul* alone, had hand in delivering the man to Satan, p.326
What delivering to Satan is, p.327
The deſtruction of the fleſh, what it is, p.328
Hymeneus and *Alexander* not killed by Satan, p. 332
Delivering to Satan not miraculous, p 336
Ἐξαιρεῖν, to put away, not alwayes to kill, p. 337
To eſchew the ſcandalous, a mean to ſave them, p. 339
The ſimilitude of a cut off member to hold forth Excommunication vindicated, p. 340
No warrant that the Apoſtles killed any, by the miniſtery of Satan, p.341
No miraculous faith required in the *Corinthians*, to pray for the killing of the man, p.342, *&c.*
Of the Leaven, 1 *Cor.* 5. p. 344
What it is to purge out the Leaven, none killed for eating Leavened Bread, p.346
To eat the Paſſeover with Leavened Bread, a violation of that Sacrament, p.348, *&c.*
Putting away of Leaven, p.349
What is meaned by the whole lump, and what by leaven. p.352, 533
Hymeneus and *Alexander*, not miraculouſly killed by Satan. p.354, 355
Erastus his expoſitions, all without ground in Scripture. p. 354
Withdrawing from ſcandalous Brethren, argueth Excommunication. p.357
How eſchewing intimate fellowſhip with a ſcandalous Brother is a Church-Cenſure, p.357, 358, 359
Sacraments, though helps of piety, yet not to be given to all. p.361, 362
Erastus his contradiction in excluding both ſome, and none at all from the Sacraments, p. 363
How withdrawing from ſcandalous Brethren, may infer Excommunication. p.365
The ſcandalous are forbidden to come to the Sacraments, p.368
An evident contradiction in *Erastus* thorow his whole Book. p.369
Whom *Erastus* excludeth from the Sacraments, p. 370
Some on earth muſt try who are to be admitted to the Sacrament, who not, p.371
Other arguments for Excommunication vindicated, p.372
The place *Gal.* 5. 12. vindicated. p.373
Paul did not judicially condemn the inceſtuous man, 1 *Cor.* 5. p.374
To eſchew the ſcandalous is materially to excommunicate them. p.377
What Presbyteries *Erastus* yeeldeth. p.379
A Presbytery at *Corinth*. p.380
Erastus granteth an Examination of ſuch as

are

are admitted to the Sacraments, and yet denieth that any should be debar'd, p. 382, 383
The places *Deut.* 17. and 2 *Chro.* 19. do prove two different Iudicatures, p. 383, 384
How the Kingly and Priestly office are different. p 384, 385
Erastus denyeth the Ministery to be peculiar to some, but proper to all under the New Testament. p. 385, 386
Two distinct Iudicatures, 2 *Chron.* 19. page 386, 387
The Magistrates are not to dispence the Word and Sacraments, as *Erastus* saith. p 391, 392
The Magistrate is not to judge who is to be admitted to the Sacrament, who not; nor hath he power of Church Discipline, page 394, 395
How *Erastus* confuteth a Presbytery. p. 398
A Church Iudicature in the Iewish Church, *Deut.* 17. *ibid.*
The Priest put no man to death. p. 401
Teaching and Iudging not one. p. 406
The Civil Iudge as a Iudge, cannot teach, p. 406, 407
Erastus maketh the Magistrate or Priest, and Pastor, formally one, p. 406
What are the *Matters of the Lord, and of the King,* 2 *Chro.* 19. p. 411, 412
Levites sometimes imployed in civil businesses, p. 414
The power of the civil Magistrate, p. 417
Men haue need of two sort of Governors, *ib.*
Magistracy and Ministery both Supreme in their own kinde, p. 417, 418
Erastus alloweth no Government, but Popedom and Monarchy, p 418, 419
Christs kingdom, how not of this world, p. 421
Moses, David, Salomon, appointed to the Priests nothing as Kings, p. 423
The Priests onely judged *de quæstione juris,* of the quæstiō of law in matters of death, p. 424
The Priests and Levites had no Law-power, by Gods Law, or from *Cæsar,* to put Christ to death, p. 426, 427
The Sanedrim had no Law-power against *Steven* to stone him, p. 427
The like of their dealing with *Paul,* true, *ib.*
How the Christian Magistrat is to be acquainted with Excommunication, p. 429, 430
A Colledge of Church rulers in the New Testament, p 431
The place, 1 *Cor.* 5. again vindicated, no miraculous killing, 1 *Cor.* 5. p 435, 436

Cap. 19. *Quest* 15.

Of the use of Excommunication, p. 437
Erastus yeeldeth there is a Presbytery, p. 438
The Magistrate under Church-discipline, *ib.*
The Magistrate not a Church-officer, p 440
A Iudicature proper to the Priest as Priest, *ib.*
The Magistrate under Ch.-discipline, p. 443
How the Magistrates consent is requisite in Excommunication, *ib.*
The Magistrates Sword no kindly mean of gaining souls, p. 445
The Scandalous are forbidden to partake of holy things, p. 448
The morally unclean debarred out of the Temple, 452, 453
No price of a Whore to be offered to God, and what is meant, p. 454, 455
Our chief Argument for Excommunication not answered, p. 456
The place, *Mat.* 5. *When thou bringest thy gift,* &c. discussed, p. 457
How men do judge of inward actions, p. 460
A frequent contradiction in *Erastus,* p. 462
What it is to be cast out of the Synagogue, p. 464
Christ and the Apostles not cast out of the Synagogue that we read, as *Erastus* dreams, 467
Ministers subject to the Magistrate, 471, 472
Morally-unclean debarred from the holy things, *ibid.*
Tell the Church discussed, p. 476, *seqs.*
Though there was no Christian Church, yet Christ might say, *Tell the Church,* p. 480
There was no more a right constituted Sanedrim in Christs time then a Christian Church, *ibid.*
Extetnal Government of the Church not in the hands of the Magistrate, 481, 482
Rebuking of Princes argue no lesse Iurisdiction then all that the Presbytery doth, p 484
Who *Erastus* excludeth from the Sacrament, *ib*

Magistrates, if Scandalous, are to be debarred from the Sacrament, p.487
Every profession maketh not men capable of the holy things of God, p.492
All sins punished with death in the Old Testament, are not therefore so punished under the New Testament, p.493
How great sins debar men from the Sacrament, p 497
The Scandalous among the Iews, debarred from the holy things, p.498
The Magistrate cannot admit to, or debar from the Sacraments, 499
The Sword no intrinsecal and kindly mean of gaining souls, p.500
Of the power of the Christian Magistrate in Ecclesiastical Discipline, p.503, &c.
Idolaters and Apostates are to be excommunicated, as *Erastus* saith, *ibid.*
The Church as the Church, not subordinate to the Magistrate, *ibid.*
Government peculiar to Church-officers, as to Priests and Levites, p.506
The Epistles to *Timothy* & *Titus* must chiefly be written to the Emperor and Magistrate, if Pastors be but servants of the Magistrate, p. 507, 508
Civil and Ecclesiastical powers immediatly from God, p.510, 511
The Magistrate not subordinate to Christ as Mediator, *ibid.*
The patern-Church of the Apostles, not ruled by the Magistrate, p.513
Erastus and *Mr. Pryn* grant there is such an ordinance as Excommunication, *ibid.*
Suspension, *ex naturâ rei*, may be where there is no Excommunication, *ibid.*
Christs admitting *Judas* to the Supper no rule to us, p.516, 517
The Gospel preached to those to whom the Sacraments cannot be dispensed, *ibid.*
The Sacrament a confirming ordinance, p.518
We partake of the sins of many, in dispensing to the unworthy the Sacraments, and not in preaching the Word to them, p.520
We know no extraordinary conversion by miracles, without the Word, p.522
The Sacrament not a first converting ordinance, yet a confirming one, *ibid.*
The Lords Supper presupposeth Faith and Conversion in the worthy Receiver in a Church-profession, p.523, &c.
The Magistrate subject to the Church, p. 528
The Church a perfit society without the Magistrate, p.529, 530
God efficacious by Preachers, not by Magistrates. p. 532
Differences between the Preachers, and the Magistrate, p.532, *&c.*
The Magistrate cannot limit the Pastors in the exercise of their calling, p. 535
That Magistrates are more hot against the Churches punishing of sin, then against sinful omissions, argueth that they are unpatient of Christs yoke, rather then that they desire to vindicate the liberty of the Subject, p.536, *&c.*
Of the Reciprocation of the Subordinations of Magistrates and Church-Officers to each other, *ibid.*
Not any power or office subject to any, but to God immediately subjection is properly of persons, p.538
A Magistrate and a Christian Magistrate, different. p.539
Two things in a Christian Magistrate, *jus*, authority, *aptitudo*, hability, p.539, *&c.*
Christianity maketh no new power of Magistracy. p.542
A fourfold consideration of the exercise of Ministerial power most necessary, upon which, and the former distinction followeth ten very considerable assertions, page 542, *&c.*
The Magistrate as the Magistrate, commandeth the exercise of the Ministerial power, but not the spiritual and sincere manner of the exercise. p.544
Magistrates as godly men, not as Magistrates command sincerity and zeal in the manner of the exercise of Ministerial power, p.545, *&c.*
A twofold goodnesse in a Christian Magistrate, essential, accidential, p.548

The

The Magistrate as such, commandeth onely in order to temporary rewards and punishments, nor holdeth he forth commands to the conscience. p. 549, *&c.*
Magistrates as Magistrates, forbid not sin as sin, under the pain of eternal wrath, p. 550
Two sorts of Subordinations, Civil, Ecclesiastick, p 553
Subordination of *Magistrate* and Church, to each others, p. 554, *&c.*
Church Offices as such, not subordinate to the *Magistrate*, *ibid.*
What power *Erastians* give to *Magistrates* in Church matters. p. 557
The minde of *Arminians* touching the power of the *Magistrate* in Church matters, *ibid.*
A threefold consideration of the *Magistrate* in relation to the Church. p. 558
Reciprocation of subordinations between Church and *Magistrate*. p. 560
The *Ministers* as *Ministers*, neither *Magistrates* nor *Subjects*. p. 564, *&c.*
The *Magistrate* as such, neither manageth his office under Christ as mediator, nor under Satan, but under God as Creator. *ibid.*
The Prince as a gifted Christian may Preach, and spred the Gospel to a Land where the Gospel hath not been heard before, page 570, *&c.*
The King and the Priest kept the Law, but in a far different way, p. 572, *&c.*
The Pastors and the Iudges do reciprocally judge and censure one another. p. 574, *&c.*
God hath not given power to the *Magistrate* and *Church*, to Iudge contrary wayes justly and unjustly in one and the same cause, p. 577
Whether Appeals may ly from Church-assembles to the *Civil Magistrate*, p. 578
Of *Pauls* appeal to *Cæsar*. *ibid.*
Divers opinions of the *Magistrates* power in Causes Ecclesiastical. p. 579, *&c.*
It is one thing to complain, another thing to appeal, p. 580
What an appeal is, *ibid.*
Refuge to the *Magistrate* is not an Appeal, p. 581
A twofold appeal, p. 582
The *Magistrates* power of punishing or his, interest of faith proveth him not to be a Iudge in Synods. p. 585, *&c.*
Pauls appeal proveth nothing against appeals, for appeals from the Church to the Christian *Magistrate*. p. 587
Paul appealed from an inferiour Civil Iudge, to a superior Civil Heathen Iudge in a matter of his head and life, not in a controversie of Religion, p. 588
What power a conqueror hath to set up a Religion in a conquered Nation. p 590
There were no appeals made to the godly Emperours of old. p. 594
To lay bands on the conscience of the *Magistrate*, to ty him to blinde obedience, the Papists, not our Doctrine. p 595
Subjection of *Magistrates* to the *Church*, no Papal tyranny, p. 600, *&c.*
The *Magistrate* as a *Magistrate*, cannot forbid sin as sin, *ibid.*
The *Magistrate* pomoteth Christs mediatory Kingdom, *ibid.*
The *Magistrate* as such, not the Vicar of the mediator Christ, p. 601
The Adversaries in the Doctrine of the *Magistrate* Popish, not we at all, *ibid.*
Pastors are made inferiour *Magistrates* in their whole *Ministery*, by the Adversaries, p. 603, *&c.*
Christian Magistracy no Ecclesiastical Administration, p. 604
The *Magistrate* as such, not the Vicar of the mediatory Kingdom, *ibid.*
Heathen *Magistrates* as such, are not oblieged to promote Christs mediatory Kingdom, p. 606
Magistracy from the Law of Nations, p. 608
The Adversaries must teach universal Redemption, p 610
Magistrates as such, not members of the Church, p. 613
Christ mediator not a temporary King, p. 614
The *Magistrat* not the servant of the Church, p. 616
The adequate and complete cause why the *Magistrate*

Magistrate is subject to the Church, p.617
That the *Magistrate* is subject to the Rebukes and censures of the Church, is proved from the Word, p.618,&c.
The supreme and principal power of Church-affairs not in either *Magistrate* or *Church*, p.620
Though the *Magistrate* punish Ecclesiastical scandals, yet his power to Iudge and punish is not Ecclesiastical and spiritual, as the Church censureth breaches of the second Table, and yet the Churches power is not Civil for that, p.622
People as people may give power to a *Magistrate* to adde his auxiliary power to defend the Church, to judge and punish offenders therein, p.625
A Governour of, or over the Church; a Governour in the Church, a Governour for the Church, different, p.628
The distinction of a Doctrinal or Declarative, and of a Punitive part of Church-Government, of which, the former is given to Pastors, the latter to the *Magistrate*, a heedlesse and senseleſſe notion, p.629,&c.
That the *Magistrates* punishing with the sword scandalous persons, should be a part of Church-government, a reasonlesse conceit, p.631
There is neither coaction nor punishment properly so called in the Church, p.632
Bullinger not of the minde of *Erastus*, p.634
The Iudgement of *Wolfgang*, *Musculus*, *Aretius*, and *Gualther*, p.634,&c.
The Errour of *Gualther* to please the usurping *Magistrate*, p.638
Their minde different from *Erastus*, p.639
The *Christian Magistrates* sword cannot supply the place of Excommunication in the Church, p.640
The confessions of the Protestant Church for this way, p.642,&c.
The testimony of *Salmasius*, p.644
Of *Simlerus*, p.645
Lavater, *Ioan. Wolphius*, *ibid.*
Of *Rob. Burhillus*. 646

The Contents of the Tractate or Dispute touching *Scandal*.

WHether things indifferent, can be commanded. *Introduction*, p.1
Indifferent things as such, not the Matter of a Church-constitution. *Introd.*
Actions are not indifferent because their circumstances are indifferent. *Introd.*
Marrying not indifferent, *Introd.*
Indifferency Metaphysical and Theological, *Introd.*
Necessity of obeying the Church in things onely necessary for the Churches Commandment, is neither a lawful nor obliging necessity. *Introd.*
Actions meerly indifferent, cannot be done in faith. *Introd.*
The unlawfulnesse unseparably adhering to actions indifferent, maketh them unlawful, *Introd.*
How exsuperancy of goodnesse is to sway the will of Rulers and people. *Introd.*
The will of Rulers not a law to us, in things indifferent, *Introd.*
The definition of a Scandal, p.3
Propositions touching Scandal from *Rom.* 14. p.4,5,6
Propositions and Rules touching Scandal, from 1 *Cor.*7. and 8. and 10. p.7,8,9
An object scandalous two wayes, p.9
Four things may be scandalous objects. *ibid.*
What is *malum aparens*, *appearance of evil*, p.11
Rules touching Scandal, p.12,13,14
Whether or no we may deny obedience to the the Laws of Superiors for fear of Scandal causelesly taken, p.15,16,17
Whether Information can remove Scandal from things not necessary, but only through the necessity of mans commandment, p.20,21
Whether the precept of obedience to superiors,

Ch. Ver.	Page.
16. 19	308,309, 310, 311, 235, 236, 295
10.5,6,10	518,519
12. 5,6	51
18.15,16,	290, 291, 292,
17,18,19, 20	293, 294, &c 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 127, 128, 129,465, 466, 467,396, 397, 611,612, 635, 636,637,638
23. 3	19
28. 18,19	393,396,397
Mark.	
7.6,7,8,9	137,138,139
Luke.	
1. 1,2,3	361
12.13,14	428, 602, 603, 392,393
17. 3	223,224,297, 298
22. 21	197, 198
ib. 24	428,602,603
ib. 26	617
John.	
9. 22	464,465, 466, 467
15. 22	606,607
18.31,36	25, 426, 421, 422, 510, 511, 603
20. 23	235,236,293
Acts.	
4. 1,20	558
5. 31	612
6. 6	12
7.1,2,51, 52	426,427
10. 15	67,68
14.11,12, 13	146, 147,148
15.22,23, 24,25,	8,45,251,252, 581, 586, 92, 222
17. 29,30	162, 155, 158, 159, 162, 168, 170
20.28,29	431,533. 534, 569
25.6,7,8, 9, 10	587,588,589
26. 10	427,428
Romans.	
12. 8	433
13. 4	406,407
b. 4,5	541, 216, 217, 534, 547, 549, 630, 631
14. 14,20	8, 1
b. 14,23	110,111, 112, 113, 14, Introduction to Scandal.
16. 17	249, 269, 356, 336, 337
1 Corinth.	
5. 1,2,3, 4,5,6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,12	238, 239, 240, 250, 255,256, 268, 269, 317, 318,319, 320, &c. 337, 338, 339, 340,341, 342,344, 345
5. 1,2,3, &c.	346,347, 356, 366,367, 374, 375, 376, 380, 381, 382, 431, 432,436, 636, 637, 638
6.1,2,3,4	299, 210
9. 15,16, 17,18,19	Treatise of Scandal,39,40, 41.also 45.
10 27,28	Of Scand. 3.
11.29,30	346, 347
10.1,2,3, 4,5	276,277, 278
11.27,28	278,279, 280, 458,459
14. 31	385, 386
16. 22	372, 373
2 Corinth.	
2. 6	221
7. 17	281, 282
10. 4,5	393,406, 603, 604
12.20,21	333,334
Galath.	
1. 8	57,58
4. 6	430
5. 12	336,337
5. 11,12	353,373, 374, 416
Ephesians	
4. 11,12, 13	24, 44, 393, 431,508, 609, 610,619,620
5. 21,22	24
Philip.	
1.15,&c.	460,462
2. 9	612, 613
Colossians.	
1. 17,18	14
ib. 18	586, 587, 613
2 Thessal.	
3. 14, 15	250, 256, 258, 259, 360, 378
1 Tim.	
1. 19,20	354,355,
2. 2	543,552,5
4. 4	65, 66
5. 17	432,434, 5
5. 19,20	222,223
6. 3,4,5	378,379
2 Tim.	
2. 15	253, 547
5. 21	11
Titus.	
1. 10	533
3. 10	378,379
Hebrews.	
3. 1,2,3	26
5. 4	253, 391,
8. 2,3	48,49
8. 5	26,27
9. 8	129
13. 7,13	628
ib. 17.	533,560, 571,
1 Pet.	
2. 13,&c	609,610
ib. 20	202
5. 1,2,3	534
5. 4	552
1 John.	
4. 1	587
2 John.	
2 Ioh.10	358
Revelat.	
2.14,&c. 9	
b. 14,20	250, 251
ib. 22	245,246
19. 10	167,168

ERRATA.

PAge 22. Line 34. for puring, read purim, p. 37. read nullis in Marg. p. 46. l. 18. for Nor r. But, p. 50 l. 1 patrons, p. 51. l. 15. r. Answered, p. 96. r. a Deo in marg. p. 117. l. 5. for religiously r. religious, p. 121. for antecedent r. assumption, p. 139. l. 20. dele not, p. 146. l. 24 for 37. r. 32, p. 210 l. 1. dele then they are b to beleeve and obey me, p. 213. l. 22. for are r. is, p. 227. l. 10. for or r. are, p. 267. l. 2. for 5. 20. r. 10 8. p 274. l dele is, p. 289. l. 34. for 99 r. 8,9, p. 386. l. 8. adde be, p 399. l. 6. r. 19, p. 521. l. 1. for 5. r. 7, p. 532. l. 2. f 13. r. 13. 2, p. 533. l. 14. for hath dominion r. hath no dominion, p. 537. l. 23. r. reciprocation, p. 548. l. 8. dele l. 31. dele 1 Tim. 5 17. Matth. 10. 10. p. 571. l. 26. for Walens r. Waleus, p. 588. l. 34. for of life and death r. matter of religion, p 633. l. 21. r. rebuke.

In Treatise of Scandal, p. 15. l. 19 for scandalously r. causelessly, p. 23. l 3. r. also, p. 78. l. 24. for to eat. r. not to

The Introduction.

SECTION I.

Certain Introductory Conclusions, tending to clear the perfection of the Scriptures in all things, as well Ceremoniall, as Non-Ceremoniall.

1. Conclusion.

Christ hath not instituted a mutable Church-Government.

Christ Jesus hath so far forth set down, and established a perfect Plat-forme of Church-Government in all Morals, not only both for the inward, but also for the outward, and externall Government of his House, that he hath left no Liberty or Latitude to Magistrates, or Churches whatsoever to choose and settle such an orderly Forme of Church-Government or Discipline, as is most suitable to their particular Civill-Government, Laws, Manners, and Customes, so this Forme be not repugnant to the Word of God.

I shall first explaine the Tearmes of the Conclusion: 2. Confirme it: 3. Vindicate it from the objections of Adversaries.

Some things Morall, some things naturall in Gods worship.

1. The *Church-Government* of which I here speak, is a Church-Government in its *Morals*: To exclude those things that are meerly *Physicall* and *Humane* in this Government, as a Pulpit of this or that matter, Stone or Timber, or of this Timber, or of any other kinde; a Communion-Table of this, or that forme; a Cup of wood, or of metall, as Silver, Tin, &c. It is a Morall thing, either Morally good or evil, that there be an Officer in the Church that Christ hath not appointed, or that there be none but such as Christ hath appointed: yet is it not Morall that a Pastor be such or such a

Country man, so he be apt to teach, and holy; Crossing, signifying the dedication of the Baptized Childe to the service of *Christ* must be Morall, but what sort of River the water of Baptisme be, is meerly Physicall, not Morall.

Circumstances either meerly morall, or 2. meerly Physicall, or 3. mixt.

So there be two sort of things in Gods Worship, things either meerly Morall, or meerly Naturall.

And here also we consider things Circumstantiall, as Time, Place, &c. And circumstances are either meerly *Physicall*, or 2. meerly *Morall*, or 3. mixt, partly *Morall*, partly *Physicall*; Circumstances meerly *Physicall* are such adjuncts of divine worship, as are common and unseparable concomitants of both civil, naturall, and Religious or Sacred actions performed by men, and as they are such, contribute no *Morall goodnesse*, or badnesse to the action or Agent in the performance thereof, such as I take to be the seven individuall proprieties of every man; *Forma, figura, locus, tempus, stirps, patria, nomen*, under *Forme and figure:* The first two, I comprehend, such a proportion of body, a man of a high stature, or low; a man beautifull, or not beautifull, to which I crave leave to reduce all externall Formes of habites, as cloathes, the head covered, or not covered, the situation of the body, as as they are in themselves, meer Physicall acts; kneeling, sitting, standing; the eyes cast down to the earth, or lifted up; the hands lifted up, or not lifted up, the knocking on the breast, or not knocking, motions of the soul, that are naturall Time, Place, Family, Country, Name, as such a person, *Thomas*, not *Iohn:* the son of such a man, not of such a man; 1. All these are common concomitants of Civill, Naturall, and Religious actions, for all actions performed by man of what kinde soever, as naturall, to eat, sleep; or civill, to declaime an oration before the people; or religious, to preach or pray, must be done by some persons, *Iohn* or *Thomas*, men of some Family, in some time, in some place, for they are not actions eternall, and so must be done in *time and place* so the Agents must, have some habite, some gesture in the doing of all these actions, and they are unseparable Adjuncts of all these actions because neither actions naturall, civill, nor Religious, can be performed, but by some persons, in some habite and gesture, in some time, in some place: and lastly, they are meere circumstantials, and contribute no Morall goodnesse or badnesse to the actions, as they are but common and unsepa-

unseparable circumstances; for because he preacheth in time, or in place simply, the preaching is neither Morally good, nor ill, better or worse, because *Thomas* prayeth in Gown or Cloak in this place, rather then that place (so it be not, *Locus ut sic*, of intention, such a Religious place, before the Image of *Christ*, or the Father, or the *Virgin Mary*) the praying is neither the more, or the lesse acceptable to God because of these common and unseparable adjuncts: Hence there can be no such force in these circumstances, as to make the actions indifferent: Such as contend for the lawfulnesse of Ceremonies, say *our circumstances of time, place and the like, is nothing but a meer blinde; for we cannot* (say they) *enumerate all these circumstances, for habite, gesture, person, are not meer circumstances and they must come in under the lap of this general, &c. or th' like:* To which I answer, that to my knowledge all these that are meer *Physical circumstances*, are particularly enumerated, such as are, 1. Time: 2. Place, 3. Person, or Agent: 4. Name. 5. Family: 6. Condition, as Country, Family, House: 7. Habits or Garments: 8. Gestures, as sitting, standing, lifting of the eyes or hands, knocking on the breast, kneeling, and there is no blinde in this enumeration, for there be no other particulars that can be enumerated, except this time of the day, eight or ten of clock, this place, not any other, *this person* not another, and these are only considered here as circumstances, not as such and such circumstances, but the truth is, the enumeration of Symbolicall Rites, as Crosse, Surplice, and the like, is really a blinde, and is an enumeration with a wide belly, and includeth species, and not individuals only, as Symbolicall Ceremonies, such as are Crossing, Bells, Oyle, Salt, Spettle, Milk, turning to the East, toward the people, from the people, toward the Altar, with a high voice, with a low voice, and a thousand the like; yea, all the old Ceremonies of *Moses* with a new face, all the toyes of the *Masse*, of the Dedication of Churches, which would fill a Volumne like the *Rationale* of *Durandus*: 2. *Some Circumstances are meerely Morall*, for as Divines distinguish Time and Place; in Time as Time, and as such a Religious Time, the *Lords Sabbath*, *Tempus*, *& tempus ut sic*, and Place as Place, or such a Religious place, *Locus*, *& locus ut sic*. So we may distinguish here, between circumstances in common or in grosse, and such and such circumstances; As time is a common adjunct of Divine Worship: But such a time, to wit, the *Lords-day*,

Our Physicall Circumstances are all easily known and numbred.

Circumstances, and such and such circumstances

day, is both the time of Worſhip, and Worſhip it ſelf. So there is place of Worſhip, and there is ſuch a Religious place, *The holy of holieſt*, the Temple. A habit is a meer accident of Worſhip, the perſon, *John* or *Thomas*, is alſo an accident; but if God command ſuch an *Ephod* as *Aaron* and the Prieſts were to wear, this is not a meer circumſtance; that the perſon who adminiſtreth the Lords-Supper, be *John* or *Thomas*, is a meer circumſtance; but that this perſon be a called Paſtor, not a private man, is more then a circumſtance. And therefore theſe circumſtances, taken in common and their Univerſall nature, are meerly *Phyſicall circumſtances*; but taken in their particular and determinate reſtrictions, as ſuch circumſtances, they may be meerly Morall circumſtances, ſuch as are the common adjunct of the time of Worſhip, the place, and the Sabbath time and the Temple for Iewiſh Worſhip. The former are circumſtances meerly Phyſicall, the latter meerly Morall; I mean, as they are reſtricted other wayes: The Temple of *Jeruſalem* ſerved as our meeting places do, to fence off the injuries of Heaven and Sun; but that is as a place, not as ſuch a place.

3. There be ſome *mixt circumſtances*, as theſe ſame Phyſicall circumſtances, clothed with their own ſeaſonable conveniences; ſo time for Worſhip, and due and convenient time is required, there may be ſome Scandalous and Superſtitious time for Worſhip. A habit in the Preacher is required, and that a grave one; a place is required for private Worſhip, and a fit place, ſuch as is not the Market-ſtreet for private Praying; the inconveniency of the circumſtance may vitiate the Worſhip.

The Scripture teacheth not meer circumſtances, but ſuppoſeth them.

I did ſay that *Chriſt Ieſus* hath ſet down in the Word, a perfect Plat-form of Church-Government, *in all Morals*; I ſay *in all Morals*, becauſe the Word doth not teach us any thing of *circumſtances, Phyſicall as Phyſicall. Scriptura talia non ponit, ſed ſupponit:* The Scripture ſaith not, That the Worſhip of God muſt have a time, a place, when, and where its to be performed, a perſon, who is to perform it, a habit, or garments on the perſon that Worſhippeth; the Scripture teacheth none of theſe, but ſuppoſeth that they are and muſt be; becauſe nature teacheth, that without time, place, perſon, habit, geſture, its unpoſſible that theſe or any humane actions can be; and therefore Prelaticall Formaliſts, do without all ſenſe or reaſon, require that we ſhould prove by Scripture, the lawfulneſſe

fulneſſe of *time, place, perſon, habit, geſture* in Gods Worſhip; for theſe are preſuppoſed in all actions, Naturall, Civill, Religious, Private, Publike, Lawfull, unlawfull, in acts of Arts, Sciences, of Morall converſing and all; yea, there is as good reaſon, that they demand Scripture to prove he muſt be a living man, who hath a reaſonable ſoul, and ſenſes, and is born of a woman, who Preacheth and Adminiſtrateth Sacraments, which is preſuppoſed by nature.

When the Heretick willeth me to prove from Scripture that *Chriſt* is very man; it is a vain thing he ſhould demand of me beſide to prove by Scripture, that *Chriſt* is ſuch a one alſo as can laugh, weep, admire, ſing, ſigh, *&c.* for theſe are preſuppoſed to follow mans nature; and if Scripture prove *Chriſt* to be a true man, it preſuppoſeth by natures light, that he can laugh, he can weep, and that in ſome time, ſome place, in ſome habit, in ſome geſture, ſo he be a man; for that is preſuppoſed by the light of natnre, and known by the moſt Barbarous who never heard of Scripture; and therefore there is no greater reaſon to put us to prove all the naturall and unſeparable circumſtances of Worſhip, ſuch as *time and place*, without which it is impoſſible any action at all can be performed; then that we ſhould preſſe Prelats to prove by Scripture, that *Iames Uſher* is born of Engliſh or Iriſh Parents, for ſenſe and nature can prove all theſe without Scripture: But becauſe their Ceremonies of Croſſing, bowing to Altars, Feſtivall dayes, Oyl, Salt, Spittle, Maſſe-clothes, are nothing warrantable by natures light, and muſt have Morall and Symbolicall influence in Worſhip, as poſitive Religious obſervances, having ſome ſpirituall ſignification and uſe, (except they be reaſonleſſe fancies) we have juſt reaſon to demand a warrant and ſpeciall Charter for all Morals, and ſo for their Ceremonies in the Scripture, and to call their *&c. humane Ceremonies and the like, a blind:* For if Prelats can prove theſe Ceremonies to be from *Chriſt*, and warranted by his Teſtament, we ſhal yield that their natural circumſtances of *time*, *When* you ſhould Bow to Altars, and Croſſe a Baptized Infant, and *Where*, or *in what place* you ſhould wear Surplice; and that the perſon that uſeth Oyl, Spittle, Salt, in Baptiſme, muſt do it in ſome habit, and with ſome geſture, either ſitting, ſtanding, lying, or kneeling, are all warrantable and lawfull from the light of nature; for if Gods light of Scripture, warrant wearing of a Surplice, as it doth warrant

Sacra-

Sacramentall eating and drinking, the light of nature must warrant these concreated, naturall, and unseparable circumstances of time, place, person, habit, gesture used in both the former and the latter.

Time and place of Ceremonies need not be proved.

But because I said that circumstances of time and place have a threefold consideration, *Physicall, Morall*, and *Mixt:* and I have spoken onely of these circumstances in a Physicall or naturall consideration; therefore in the other two considerations there being involved some Morall goodnesse, and because there is no Morall goodnesse imaginable, but it must have its essentiall form and being from a Law or word of God; therefore all the former circumstances, as they are clothed with either morall conveniency and expediency, or with some Religious positive goodnesse, must be warranted by the Word of God, or the Rules of sinlesse and spirituall Prudence, which cannot deviate from the word of God: For circumstances clothed with Religious Positive goodnesse, such as are the Sabbath day, the holy of Holiest, the Temple; these are not meer circumstances, but worship it self: So a Religious habit, as an *Ephod* or a *Surplice*, is not a meer circumstance, or a meer habit, but a worship, or such a part or limb of worship as must be warranted by the word of truth, else it is nothing but a will-device, and a forgery, and so to be rejected. And as touching things of Prudence, they are things properly mixt, as at what hour Sermon shall begin in such a Church, at eight, or nine, or ten of the clock; how the worship shall be ordered, whether you should begin the Worship with a word of Prayer, or a word of Praising, or a word of Exhorting to stir up for the duty of the day, is a matter of Prudence; and because God hath not laid the band of a Precept on us, to begin with either of the three; therefore it would seem, that though the things themselves be Morall, and must be warranted by a *Word of God*; yet the order is not Morall, but Prudentiall, and so cannot fall under a command of the Church; for to me it is hard, that men and the Church should lay on a tie or bond of a Precept where God hath laid on no such bond; The Church, in these mixt things, where the Morality is not clear, at fartheſt, can but go on to directive advises, as *Paul* doth, 1 *Cor.* 7. 6. 12. Not to imposing of Laws, nor to injunctions or Commandments under the pain of Church-censures; for *Christ* must bind and ratifie in Heaven, all Church-censures on earth, and so the Church cannot command nor censure, but as *Christ* himself would command or censure.

Nom

Now because the rest of the conclusion shall be farther cleared; I prove that *Christ* hath so far forth set down a perfect Plat-form of Church-Government in the Scripture, as he hath not given a liberty to Rulers, Prelats, or to the Church her self, to set up a variable Plat-form sutable to their particular Civill Government, Laws, Manners and Customes.

1 *Arg.* What ever *maketh the man of God perfect, thorowly furnished unto all good workes, and is written for this end, that any Timothy or Faithfull Pastor, might know how he ought to behave himself in the House of God.* That must make the *man of God perfect* in this good work, of holy walking, as a perfect Governour, or a perfect Church-member, to be governed in all Morall acts of Discipline and godly behaviour, according to the spirituall policie of the Lords house, and so must hold forth a perfect Plat-form of Discipline, which doth not varie, ebbe and flow, and alter according to the Civill Government, Laws, Manners and Customs of men: But the Scriptures of God doth so instruct all Members of the visible Church, both Governours and governed, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16, 17. 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. *Ergo*, the Scripture must hold forth a perfect form of Discipline which doth not varie, ebbe, flow, and alter according to the Civill Governments, Laws, Manners and Customes of men. The Proposition is made good: Because, 1. to walk according to the spirituall Policie of the Lords house, must be a good work, and so a Morall and Lawfull work, and a due conversing in the spirituall Society of the Church, according to the Rule of the Word. 2. If this Morall walking be according to a Rule that may crook, bow and varie according as Civill Customes of men and Cities alter and varie at mens pleasure, It is a Morall walking, no more according to the Rule of Scripture, then the contradicent thereof is according to this Rule, but falleth and riseth, hath its ups and downs at the meer nod and pleasure of men, who may change Customes and Manners every year twice, if so it please them. For what Scripture teacheth me a Civill Customs of a City, *as not to carry Armour in the night, to take up the Names of all between sixteen years of age and sixty*? Or what Scripture teacheth me, a *Bishop* may be above the Pastors of the Church, or a *Bishop* may not be? *Surplice, Crossing, Bowing* and Cringing to wooden Altars, may be or may not be? Deacons may be, or may not be? even as customes and guises of the

1. *Argum.* to prove that the Platform of Church-Government, is not mutable at mens will.

the Civill State, appear as Meteors in the Aire, and in the fourth part of a night, disappear and vanish to nothing; to say, that the word teacheth the Church to abstain from blood, is a part of the perfection of the Scripture, and yet the Scripture teaches that abstinence from blood, not as an eternall, and unalterable Law, for we are not now tied to abstain from blood, therefore the Scripture may make the man of God perfect in some works that are alterable and changeable: This (I say) is no Answer, for saying that God should now make abstinence from blood, and things strangled, indifferent, as he made them in that intervall of time, *Acts* 15. When the Ceremonies were mortall, but not deadly and unlawfull, as is clear in that *Paul*, *Act.*16.1,2,3. circumcised *Timothy*, that Rite being then indifferent; and yet he writeth in another case, when the Gospel is now fully promulgated, that to be circumcised maketh a man a debtor in conscience, to keep the whole Law of *Moses*, and so to *abstaine from eating of blood*, and things strangled, must be a falling from the Grace of *Christ*, and an Apostacy from the Gospel, *Gal.*5.1,2,3.4,5,6,7. The like I say of observing of dayes, which, *Rom.*14.5,6. were indifferent, and in another case, *Gal.*4.9,10. *Col.*2.16,17. Deadly, unlawfull, and not necessary, so the matter, *Acts* 15. which in the case of scandilizing the weak, is abstinence from things indifferent, say that they are indifferent, bindeth as a perpetuall Law to the end of the world, and bindeth us this same very day, *Rom.*14.20. In the Morality of it, as abstinence from murthering, *One for whom Christ died*, Rom.14.15. 1 *Cor.*8. 12,13. 1 *Cor.*10.26,27,28. And upon the ground laid by Prelates, which is most false and untrue, to wit, that many Positive things in Church-Government, such as are Prelats deemed to be warranted by Apostolick, though not by Divine right: Ceremonies, and Crossing, kneeling to bread, Altars, Surplice, Rocher, corner-Cap, yea, and Circumcision, a Passeover-Lambe, and all the Jewish Ceremonies, though with another spirit and intention, then to shadow forth *Christ* to come in the flesh, imagined to be indifferent, and alterable things, we hold that all these are to be abstained from, as eating of blood, and things strangled of old were, if you say they are as indifferent, as blood, and some meats were in the case, *Act.*15. *Rom.* 14. 1 *Cor.*8. 1 *Cor.*10. Its a most false principle as we shall hear, and therefore the Scripture, if it make *the man of God perfect to every*

Act. 15.

The Scriptures way of teaching that indifferent things are alterable, is it self unalterable.

very good Work; as the *Apostle* saith; it must teach us to abstain from all these as scandalous, and must set down as perfect and particular directions for Church-Government, as *Paul* doth, *Rom.* 14. Set down a particular Platform, how we shall eschew Murther; for scandalizing our Brethren in the use of things indifferent, is spirituall Murther, *Rom.* 14.15. 20.

2. *Arg.* That which is *a lamp to the feet, and a light to the path*, Psal. 119.105. *And causeth us understand Equity, Iudgement, Righteousnesse, and every good way*, Prov. 2.9. *And to walk safely, so that our feet stumble not*, Prov. 3.25. Prov. 4,11,12. Prov. 6.23. That must be a lamp and light to our feet, and walking in a Platform of Church-Discipline, so as we shall not erre, sin or stumble therein: But if the light be so various, doubtfull, alterable, as we may walk this way, or the contrary way, *according to the Civill Laws, alterable Customes and Manners of the people*, we shall not so be guided in *our path, as our feet shall not stumble*; the Church might then suffer *Jezabell* to Prophecie, and these that hath the Doctrine of *Balaam*, or not suffer them, as the Civill Laws, and alterable Customes of the people should require: Now the Scriptures doth clearly insinuate, that the Law and will of God revealed in the Word, is a Rule of walking straightly and of declining sin, and any stumbling in our way, which deserveth a rebuke and a threatning, such as *Christ* uttereth against the *Church of Pergamos*, Rev. 2. 14, 15, 16. And of *Thyatira*, v. 17, 18. Now if these Churches had no certain Rule or Word of God, from which they should deviate and erre in their path of Discipline, but the *Customes and alterable Civill Laws and Manners of men*, they were unjustly rebuked by Christ, which to aver were Blasphemy.

2, Argum.

The Scripture shall not teach when we sin in Church-Policie, when not, if the Platform be alterable at mens will.

Prelats say, *Some things in Church-Policie, are Fundamentals, not to be altered; but there be other things alterable. And of things of Policie of the former notion, We have a certain Platform in Scripture; but of the latter, not any at all is necessary; and the not suffering of false Teachers in the Church, is of the former sort.* But I Answer, some Scripture or reason ought to be given of this distinction: If all be Morall and unalterable that are necessary to Salvation, its good: But to suppresse *Jezabell* and false teachers, is not necessary, *Necessitate medii*; for then the Salvation of that Church were desperate, and past remedy, which should suffer false teachers; surely then

There is no reason why some things Positive of Church-Policie are alterable, some not.

Pergamos and Thyatira, were in a certain irremediable way of Eternall Damnation, as are these who are void of all Faith and knowledge of Fundamentall Articles; I conceive *Prelats* will hold their hand, and not be so rash as to say this; If these other things of Policie be necessary, *necessitate precepti*, in regard that Iesus Christ hath commanded them to be observed, why then are some things alterable which *Christ* hath commanded to be observed, some things unalterable? Crosse & Surplice, which Prelats say have been in the Church these twelve hundred yeers, are in themselves as positive, & have as small *affinity with the Civil Laws, Customes & Manners of Nations* (except they mean sinfull Customes) as Sacramentall eating and drinking. And the like may be said of all the alterable Ceremonies sometimes in use, in *England*, and now in force amongst *Papists*.

3. Argum.

3. *Arg.* That Commandement which *Timothy* is to *keep without spot unrebukeable, untill the appearing of our Lord Iesus Christ* 1 Tim. 6.13. is no alterable command that *falleth and riseth with the Customes, Civill Laws and Manners of men.* But *Paul* commandeth under that, every Positive Law of *Church-Discipline* to be thus kept, of which he speaketh in these Epistles to *Timothy*.

3. Book, Eccles. Polic, pag. 117, 118. The place, 1 Tim, 6. 13. discussed.

Mr. *Hooker* denyeth the assumption; *For* Paul (saith he) *restraineth the words to one speciall Commandment amongst many; and therefore it is not said, keep the Ordinances, Laws, Constitutions, which thou hast received; but* τὴν ἐντολὴν, *that great Commandment, which doth principally concern thee and thy calling, that Commandment that* Christ *did so often inculcate unto* Peter (Feed my sheep) *and that* Act. 20. Attend to your selves and all the flock, *&c. And that*, 2 Tim. 4.1. I charge thee in the sight of God, *&c.* Preach the word, and teach the Gospel without mixture, *&c. And these words (till the appearance of* Christ) *doth not import the time wherein it should be kept; but rather the time whereunto the finall reward for keeping it was reserved according to that, henceforth is laid up for me a crown of Righteousnesse. It doth not import perpetuall observation of the Apostles Commandment, for it bindeth not to the Precept of chooſing of Widows, as the Adversaries grant. We do not deny, but certain things were Commanded to be, though Positive, yet perpetuall in the Church. Ans.* 1. If *Paul* restrain this to one speciall Commandment, sure it is so generall and comprehensive a Commandment of feeding the Flock, as taketh in all the speciall Positive Commandments belonging

longing to feeding, by both Word and Discipline, which is enough for the perpetuity of all Positive precepts of Discipline and Policie, even till *Christs* appearance to judge the world; and I wonder that *Hooker* expoundeth this by 2. *Tim.* 4.1. As if *Paul* did mean the precept of Preaching only, and that *soundly and without mixture*; and yet passe by the Parallel place, 1 *Tim.* 5,21. Almestin the same stile of Language, in which place he speaketh of many speciall Positive precepts and Rules of Policie, as of poor widows, the Almes to be given to them; the *not rebuking of an Elder*, the office of Elders Governing, and of *Elders labouring in the Word and Doctrine*, the not receiving an accusation against an Elder, but under two or three Witnesses, the publike rebuking of those who offend publikely, the not admitting to the Ministry raw and green souldiers not tryed, and many other particulars of Policie, of all which he saith gravely, v. 21. *I charge thee before God and the Lord Iesus Christ, and the Elect Angels, that thou observe these things &c.* Certainly, ταῦτα, *these things* was not one Commandment, but all the precepts of Faith, and of *Church-Government* spoken of in this Epistle; and truly I shall think that *Paul* who particularizeth that *Timothy* should *not drink water, but a little wine because of his infirmity, and of bringing with him the cloak that he left at* Troas, *and the parchments*, 2 *Tim.*4 doth far more specifie all the positives of policie, and writ, how all the *Timothies* and *Pastors* are to *behave themselves in the Church of God*: If Ceremonies and all these alterable trifles had not been excluded out of the Platforme; for a Religious *Masse-Surplice*, is of far more consequence then *Pauls* old cloak, and yet *Paul* spake of the one in Canonick-Scripture, never of the other; and *Oyle, Spittle, Salt, Crosse* in Baptisme being positive significant Rites, and having continued in the Church so many hundred years, should far rather have been specified in Scripture then *Timothies drinking of water*: yea, and if all the alterable positive things of Policy, as *Crosse, Surplice*, be commanded as necessary in the generall, though not in this or that particular, as *Hooker* and other *Formalists* do teach, then sure the meaning must be: *I give to thee, O* Timothy, *charge in the sight of God who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, &c. That thou keep this Commandment of Crossing, Surplice, bowing to Altars, of corner-Cap, or of the equivalent of these, without spot irrebukeable to the appearance of Jesus Christ;*

Pauls cloak of lesse consequence, then Positives of policie.

Christ; for the precept of feeding the Flock, must include all these; and though Ceremonies in particular be alterable, and not commanded in *Hythothesie*; yet that in generall there should be such positive Ceremonies is necessary, and the *Apostle* (say they) commandeth them, 1 *Cor.*14.40. Yea, (as *Dunam* saith) humane Holydayes, are commanded in the fourth Commandment, and *Burges* saith, all the Ceremonies are commanded in the third Commandment, and Formalists; who denyed the Prelate to be of Divine institution, made a Ceremony of him, and made him a decent and orderly thing; which as the *Poet* said, to me is like the act of death, that brought *Great Alexander*, to whom the whole world was not sufficient, in small bounds, in the Grave under two foot of earth, and this maketh the great Pope, the Catholick Bishop of the earth a little Ceremony: But this little Ceremony hath these many hundred years infested the whole earth. 2. If this precept be not a perpetuall binding precept till *Christs* second appearance, but only rewarded with life eternall at Christs appearance, yet shall it follow that all things included in the precept of feeding the flock, and so all the Surplice, Crossing, Will-worship or their equivalent, without which, feeding cannot be in a decent and orderly way (as they say from, 1 *Cor.*14.40.) must be rewarded with life eternall: let *Formalists* wait at the day of judgement for a reward, of a Garment of glory for wearing a linning Surplice, my faith cannot reach it.

3. For the *chooſing of Widovves* that are poor to take care of the poor and sicke in Hospitals; we think it just as necessary now as then, though no wayes, if there be none sick, and poor in the *Church*: But that *Widows* were *Church-Officers* ordained, as were *Deacons*, *Act.6.6.* we never thought, and therefore we do not see that the wanting of such Widows, is the want of a Positive institution of *Church-Policy*; for other positive things of policy that should be of perpetuall use, and not all of the same kinde, and of equall necessity: I see no reason (which I speak for *Apostles*) which were necessary then, and not now; But if from thence *Formalists* infer, that many positive things of policy are alterable, I can infer with equall strength of reason, that then Pastors, and Teachers are alterable by the *Church*, for if the one have a Divine institution to warrant it, *Eph.*4.11,12,13. so hath the other; and if Prelates may come themselves into the Church without any warrant but this, that

that *Apostles* are alterable, and may put out Pastors and Teachers, because God hath put out *Apostles*; we have a new world of alterable *Church-Policy*. 5. Reverent *Beza* referreth the Commandment to the Platforme of Discipline: So *Ambrose* in *Loc.* and *Chrysostome Homil.* 18. so *Diodat. This Commandment which is*, ver. 11, 12. *Or generally all other Commandments, which are contained in this Epistle*; Popish Writers confesse the same, though to the disadvantage of their Cause, who maintain unwritten Church-Policy and Ceremonies: So *Lyra* and *Nicol. Gorran. Mandatum quod Deus, & ego mandavimus*, the *Commandment of the Lord, and of me his Apostle, Cornelius a lapide*: *Quicquid tibi, O Episcope, hac Epistolâ prescripsi, & demandavi, hoc serva: Salmeron, alii per mandatum intelligunt, Quecunque mandavi spectantia ad munus boni Episcopi.*

SECT. II.

THE Adversaries amongst these things of *Church-Policy*, do reckon such things as concerne the outward man, and externals only; and therefore *Bilson*, *Hooker* and the rest, as *Cameron* and others, will have Christs kingdom altogether Spirituall, Mysticall, and invisible, and Christ to them is not a King to binde the externall man, nor doth he as King take care of the externall government of his own house, that belongeth (say they) as other externall things to the Civill Magistrate, who with advise and counsell of the Church, Bishops and their unhallowed Members, may make Lawes in all externals, for the Government of the Church, and all these externals though Positive, are alterable; yea, and added to the word, though not as additions corrupting, but as perfecting and adorning the word of God and his worship.

Bilson of perpetuall Gover. c. 3. *Hooker* of Eccles. Polic. l. 3.

In opposition to this, our fourth Argument shall be, he who is the only Head, Lord, and King of his Church, must governe the politick, externall body his Church, perfectly by Laws of his own spirituall policy, and that more perfectly then any earthly Monarch, or State doth their subjects, or any Commanders, or any Lord or Master of Family, doth their Army, Souldiers, and members of their Family.

4. *Arg.* Christ the Head of his Church in the externall policy thereof.

But Christ is the head and only head of the Church, for by what title Christ *is before all things, he in whom all things consist, and is the beginning, the first borne from the dead*, and *hath the preheminence in all*

all things; and he is onely, solely and absolutely all these, by the same title he is the Head, and so the onely *Head of the Body the Church*, *Col.*1.17,18. And he is the head of his Politick body, and so a head in all externals, as well as of mysticall and invisible body, for if his *Church* be an externall Politicall body, and ruled by Organs, Eyes, Watchmen, Rulers, Feeders, and such as externally guideth the flock, as it is, *Eph.* 4.11,12,13,14,15,16. 1 *Cor.*12.28. *Matth.*16.17,18. A society to which *Christ* hath given the keys of his House, and so externall power in a visible Politick Court on earth to *binde and loose*, to take in and put out, to *open and shut* the doors of his visible Politick house; then this Politick body must have a head in externall policy, and this head in externals must as a head governe by Laws all the members in their externall society; for a body without a head is a monster, and a Politick body, without a head Politick, and one that ruleth Politically, is a Monster. And *Christ* is the King, yea the only King of his own Kingdom, either as this Kingdom is mysticall and invisible, or as it is Politick, externall, and visible on earth, as these Scriptures proveth, 1. *Mat.* 28.18. *Iesus saith unto me, is all power given in Heaven and in earth:* I hope this power is only given to *Christ*, not to Pope or earthly Prince: It is *the name above all names*, Phil.2.9. *King of Kings*, *Rev.*17.14. And upon this Kingly power, Christ doth an externall Act of Royall power, and giveth not only an inward but also a Politicall, externall power to his disciples, *ver.*19. *Go Teach, and Baptize all Nations:* Is this only inward and heart-teaching, and inward Baptizing by the spirit? I think not, God hath reserved that to himself only, *Isa.*54.13. *Ioh.*6.44.45. *Joh.*1.33. and *Ioh.*20,21. 22. Upon this that the Father sent *Christ*, and so set him his King upon his holy hill of *Zion*, *Psa.*2.6. *Christ* performeth an externall Politick mission, and sendeth his disciples with power in a Politick externall way to remit and retain sins, in an externall way, for there is clearly two remittings and retainings of sins in the Text: None can say of the Church, *its my Church*, but he who is King of the *Church*; and *Christ* saith, *Matth*,16.18. that it is his *Church*, and upon this it is his Kingdom, and the keyes are his keys, and they are keys of a Kingdom visible and Politick on earth, as is evident, *ver.* 19. I *will give unto thee, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt binde on earth*, (in an externall Politicall court

of

of *Church Rulers*, as it is differenced from an internal, and mysticall binding in Heaven) *shall be bound in Heaven, &c.* For it is clear that there is an internall binding in Heaven, and a Politicall and externall binding on earth, and both are done by the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: But *Christ* can have or give no Politicall or externall keys of an externall and Politicall *King*, but as he is a *King*: Yea, and Excommunication doth not only binde the inward man in Heaven, but also the externall man on earth, excluding him from the Society of the *Church* as a Heathen, and a Publican, and purging him out from the externall communion of the *Church*, as if he were now no brother, *Matth.* 18.17,18. 1 *Cor.* 5.7.10,11,12. Now this externall separating and judging of an offender by the *Church* is done by the keys of the Kingdom; *Ergo*, by *Christ* as a King, ruling the externall man Politically, and so by the *key of the house of David*, which is laid upon *Christs* shoulder, *Isa.* 22. 22. And by a Royall Act of him, *upon whose shoulder is the Government*, Isa. 9.6. *Who sitteth upon the throne of David to order the kingdom, & to establish it with judgement & justice.* For the Church doth bind and loose in the externall Court, either by a Commission from him who as head of the Church, and who as King gave to her the Keys of the Kingdom; or by a generall Arbitrary power given to the *Magistrate* and Church, to do in these things as they please; so they do nothing contrary to the Word, though not according to the Word, as they are to do in Doctrinals; if the former be said, then must the externall Government be upon the shoulder of *Christ* as King, which is that which we teach: If the latter be said, then might the *Magistrate* & Church appoint such an Ordinance as excommunication, and so they may by their Arbitrary power, make a Gospel Promise of ratifying an Ordinance in heaven, and of pardoning sins in heaven; for he that can make the ordinance, can make also the Gospel-Promise, and he that can by an Arbitrary power make one Promise or part of the Gospel, may make all. And if either *Magistrate* or *Church* can appoint such an Ordinance as hath a Promise of binding & loosing made good in heaven, they may also take away such Ordinances and Gospel-Promises; for it is the same power to make and adde, to unmake and destroy Ordinances. Hence also I argue for the Immutability of a Scripturall Platform, that the Church cannot alter at her will: thus, That must be of Divine

A promise of Pardoning of sin made to the right use of the keys proveth discipline to be a part of the Gospel.

vine institution which is an essentiall part of the Gospel; but the Platform of *Church-Government* in the word is such, and so must be no lesse Immutable then the Gospel. I make good the major Proposition thus: That which essentially includeth a Promise of the New Testament, that must be a part of the Gospel which consisteth especially of Promises, *Heb.* 8.6. 2 *Cor.* 7.1, *Gal.* 3.17. *Gal.* 4.23, 24. But there's a Promise of forgiving sins in Heaven made to the *Church*, using the Keys aright, and of *Christs* presence in the excercise of the Keys, as walking amongst the golden Candlesticks, *Matth.* 18. 18,19. 20. *Math.* 16. 18,19. *Ioh.* 20. 23. *Rev.* 2.1. Now if any shall object, this Argument proveth only that which is not denyed, to wit, that some part of Discipline only, is of Divine institution which is not denyed, for a power of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins, is of Divine institution: But hence it is not concluded that the whole Platform, and all the limbs, joynts, bones, and toes are of Divine institution, they being matters of smaller concernment. I Answer, As from a part of the Doctrine of the Law and Gospel that is of Divine institution; for Example, that I keep, observe and do the Law, that I believe and repent, which are things of Divine institution: I infer that the whole Platform of Law and Gospel, is of Divine institution, and the particulars of Obedience and Faith, are not Arbitrary to the *Church*; just so in Discipline, I say the like, there is no more reason for one part written by God, then for another.

Farther, if the *Church* be a visible Politick Kingdom, as it is, *Mat.* 13. v. 45,46,47,48. *Matth.* 16.19. *Matth.* 8. 12. And if the Word be the Word, Scepter and Law of the Kingdom, as it is, *Matth.* 6. 10. *Matth.* 13.11. *Luk.* 4.43. *Matth.* 4. 23. *Mark* 13.8. *Luk.* 21. 10.14. *Luk.* 8.10. Yea, the Sword and Royall power of the King, *Rev.* 1.16. *Rev.* 19.15. By which he Ruleth and Raigneth in his *Church*, *Isa.* 11. v. 4. *Psal.* 110. 2. *Heb.* 1.8,9. *Psal.* 45. 3,4,5,6,7. *Isa.* 61.1,2. 2 *Cor.* 10.4,5 6. 1 *Pet.* 2.4,5,6,7. And if by this Word the King Raigneth, bindeth, looseth, and conquereth souls and subdueth his Enemies, *Matth.* 18. 18,19,20. *Matth.* 16.19. *Rev.* 6.2. Then certainly *Christ* must Raign Politically, and externally in his *Church*, and walk in the midst of the golden Candlesticks, *Rev.* 2.1. And if *Christ* Ascending to Heaven as a Victorious King, *Leading Captivity Captive, gave gifts to men*, and appointed an externall Policie,

policie, for the gathering of his Saints by the Miniſtery of certain officers of his Kingdom, as it is, *Pſal.* 68. 18. *Even that the Lord God might dwell amongſt them, Eph.* 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Then he muſt Raign in the externall Policie of Paſtors, Teachers, Elders, by Word, Sacraments, and Diſcipline. Now the King himſelf, the Lord who Raigneth in this externall Policie, muſt be the only Law-giver, *Iam.* 4. 12. *Iſa.* 33. *v.* 22. There can be no *Rabbies* or *Doctors* on earth, who as little Kings can make Laws under him, *Mat.* 23. *v.* 8, 9, 10. Yea, not *Apoſtles* who can teach how the Worſhip ſhould externally be ordered, but what they receive of the *King of the Church*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *Act.* 15. v. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. How the houſe ſhould be Governed, *Heb.* 3. 1, 2. 4, 5. Yea, nothing more reaſonable, then that *Whatſoever is commanded by the God of Heaven, ſhould be done in, and for the houſe of the God of Heaven*, under the pain of his Wrath, *Ezr.* 7. 23. 1. That there ſhould be Officers in a Kingdom, and Laws to Govern the Subjects, beſide the will of the Prince or Judges of the Land, or that the Members of a Family, or Souldiers in an Army ſhould be Governed by any Rule, Cuſtome, or Law, beſide or without the will of the Maſter of the Houſe, and of the Generall & Commanders, is all one, as if Subjects, Families and Souldiers, ſhould be Ruled and Governed by their own will and wiſdome, and not by their King, Iudges, Maſters and Commanders; for the queſtion is upon this undeniable ſuppoſition, that *Chriſt* is the only Head and King of his Church, and ſo the Head and King of Prelats (if they be of the body) and of the Rulers, Guides, and Paſtors of the *Church*, which are to be Governed and Ruled by certain Laws, no leſſe then the people, whither or no this Repreſentative Church of Rulers, being Subjects and Members of the Head and King of the *Church*, are to be Ruled by the wiſdome, Laws, and Commandments of this King the *Lord Jeſus*; or if they have granted to them a vaſt Arbitrary power to Govern both themſelves and the people, by adding Poſitive Mandats of Arbitrary Commanders, ſuch as Prelats are (in the minde of thoſe who think they have no patent of any Divine right) and of Surplice, Croſſing, kneeling for reverence to wood, to bread and wine. The matter cannot be helped by ſaying that *Chriſt* is the Myſticall, Inviſible King, (ſome doubt if he be the only King of the *Church*, which is too groſſe to be refuted) of the *Church* in

The will of Chriſt as King, is the Rule of the Government of his houſe.

things spirituall, and in regard of the inward operation of the Spirit; but he is not a Politicall and visible Head in regard of externall Policie; this distinction must hold also in regard of the people, who as *Christians* and believers are rather under *Christ* as a Mysticall and invisible Head, then the Rulers who are not as Rulers, but only in so far as they are believers, Mysticall Members of the Head *Christ*; for *Christ* exerciseth no Mysticall and Internall operations of saving Grace upon Rulers as Rulers; but upon Rulers as believers, then he cannot be the Mysticall and invisible King of Rulers as Rulers, to give them as a King, an Arbitrary power to be little Kings under him, to Govern as they please; and the truth is, *Christ* is a Politicall Head and King of his *Church*, not properly a visible Head, 2 *Cor.* 5.16. Except that he is a visible Head in this sense, in that he Raigneth and Ruleth, even in the externall visible Policie of his *Church*, through all the Catholick visible *Church*, in his Officers, Lawfull Synods, Ordinances, giving them Laws in all Positive externals, which place the Beast, the King of the Bottomlesse Pit, the *Pope* usurpeth: But I would gladly be informed of *Formalists*, how the King is the Head and Vicegerent of *Christ* over the *Church*; if *Christs* Kingdom be only spirituall, Mysticall Internall, not Politicall, not externall; for sure the *King* as *King*, exerciseth no internall and Mysticall operations upon the consciences of men under *Jesus Christ*, his power is only Politicall and Civilly Politicall, about, or without the *Church*, not properly within the *Church*: Surely if Rulers be Subjects and Members under *Christ* the Head and King: I shall believe that *Christ* must in all Positive things of externall Policie, give to them Particular Laws in the Scripture, and Rule them; and that they being Members, not the Head, must as particularly be Ruled in all externals Positive, by the will and Law of the Head *Christ*, and that they are not Kings, Heads and Law givers, and Rulers to themselves: And especially upon these considerations. This King and Head must be particular in an immutable, perpetuall, and unalterable Platform of Church-Government. 1. *Salomon* for wisdome in the order, degrees, number, attire of his servants and Policie of his house to the admiration of the *Queen of Sheba*, in this we conceive was a type of a greater then *Salomon*. 2. The Positives of the policie of *Christs* house, must be congruous to a supernaturall end, the edification of souls, and that

Sym-

Symbolicall Rites of mens deviſing, ſpeak ſupernaturall duties, that *Chriſt* hath already ſpoken in the Scripture, as that *Croſſing* ſpell out Dedication to *Chriſts* Service, *Surplice*, paſtorall holineſſe, which both are *Goſpel truths*, 1. *Pet.* 1.18. 1 *Pet.* 2.24. *Iſa.* 52.11. Is as ſupernaturall a mean for edification, as that bread and wine ſignifie *Chriſts* body and blood; & therefore the one more then the other ought not to be left to humane reaſon, but muſt be expreſly ſet down in Scripture. 3. All theſe muſt lay a tie upon the conſcience; but if they have their riſe from the vain will of *Prelats* and men, they can never bind my conſcience; for how can they bind my conſcience as the Scripture bindeth them on me, and yet Rulers as Rulers in the name of *Chriſt* the King, cannot preſſe them upon me? *Formaliſts* give divers Replies to this: As, 1. *Hooker*: *You are conſtrained to ſay that of many things of Church-Policie, ſome are of great weight, ſome of leſſe, that what hath been urged of immutability of Laws, it extendeth in truth no farther then only to Laws, wherein things of greater moment are preſcribed; as Paſtors, Lay-Elders, Deacons, Synods, Widows; elſe come to particulars, and ſhew if all yours be perpetuall, and our particulars unlawfull.* *Anſ.* 1. Things of greater and leſſe weight, we acknowledge in Church-Policie, and in Doctrinals too; but in this ſenſe only: 1. That they be things Poſitive. 2. They be both things that are unchangeable by any, except by God himſelf, and oblige us *Neceſſitate precepti*, by the neceſſity of a Divine Commandment, as *Matth.* 23. 23. *To pay tythe of Mint, Anniſe, and Cummin*, is a leſſe matter then the weightier duties of the Law, Iudgement, Mercy, and Faith: But there is nothing ſo ſmall in either Doctrinals or Policie, ſo as men may alter, omit, and leave off theſe ſmalleſt Poſitive things that God hath commanded; for *Chriſt* ſaith, *Paying of tythe of Mint, ought not to be omitted*, though the *Church of Phariſees* ſhould neglect it, and command ſome other petty ſmall things in place thereof: If therefore *Prelats* ſhould obliterate the Office of Ruling Elders which *Chriſt* the Lord inſtituted in his Church, and put themſelves in as Governours in their Room, they may put out Paſtors and Sacraments, and take in for them, *Turkiſh Prieſts*, and Circumciſion, with a ſignification that Chriſt is already come in the fleſh: We urge the immutability of Chriſts Laws, as well in the ſmalleſt as greateſt things, though the Commandments of Chriſt be greater or leſſe in

Hooker, Eccleſ. Policie, l. 3. 123, 124.

Things of Policie, becauſe leſſe weighty then the greater things of the Law, are not therefore mutable at the pleaſure of men.

regard of the intrinsecall matter, as to use water in Baptisme, or to Baptise is lesse then to Preach Christ, and believe in him, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Yet they are both alike great, in regard of the Authority of Christ the Commander, *Matth.* 28. 18, 19. And its too great boldnesse to alter any Commandment of Christ, for the smallnesse of the matter, for it lieth upon our conscience, not because it is a greater or a lesser thing, and hath degrees of obligatory necessity, lying in it for the matter; but it tyeth us for the Authority of the Law-giver: Now Gods Authority is the same when he saith, (*You shall not Worship false Gods, but me the only true God*) And when he saith, (*You shall not adde of your own one ring or pin to the Ark, Tabernacle Temple*) yea, either to break or teach others, to break one of the least of the Commandments of God, maketh men the least in the Kingdom of God, *Matth.* 5. 18. And to offend in one is to offend in all, *Iam.* 2. 10. 2. That our things of *Church-Policie* are perpetuall, we prove, and that what we hold of this kinde, we make good to be contained in the Scripture, either expresly, or by due consequence; and so the Church and their Rulers, act nothing in our way, but as Subordinate to Christ as King and Head of the Church, and *Surplice, humane Prelats, Crossing,* we hold unlawfull in the house of God, because they are not warranted by the King and Head Christs word; and because the devisers and practisers of these do neither devise nor act, in these, as Subordinate to *Jesus Christ* as King, Priest, or Prophet, by the grant of our Adversaries.

Hooker, l. 3. Eccles. Pol. pag. 124. *The matters wherein Church-Policy are conversant, are the publick Religious duties of the Church, as administration of the Word, Sacraments, Prayers, Spirituall censures of the Church and the like, to these the Church stand alwayes bound; and where Policy is, it cannot but appoint, some to be leaders of others, and some to be led; If the blinde lead the blinde, they both perish: and where the Clergy is any great multitude, order requireth that they be distinguished by degrees, as Apostles and Pastors were in the Apostolick Church: And number of specialities there are which make for the more convenient being of these principall parts of Policy.*

Ans. 1. If *Christ* as King have appointed word and Sacraments in generall, and Censures; he hath appointed the Word, Sacraments and Censure in speciall; to wit, such a word, such Sacraments,

ments, Baptisme, the Lords-Supper, such Censures, Excommunication, admonition, or then he hath left the Specialities of written and unwritten Word, to the arbitriment of men, and that there be Excommunication, or no Excommunication; and this Doctrinall and the like he hath left to mens devising; to wit, *(Crossing is a Dedication of the childe to Christ)* now *Jerome* Adverſ. Helvid. saith *Vt hec que scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non sunt scripta renuimus*, and Auguſt. Lib. de pasto. c. 11. *Quicquid inde (è scriptura) Andieritis, hoc nobis bene sapiat, Quicquid extraest, respuite, ne erretis in nebulâ.* Now to say, we may receive some truths of things Arbitrary or mutable, crosseth *Cyrill. Alexand. Glaphyre* in *Gen.* l. 2. ὁ γὰρ ἂν εἰρήκειν ἡ θεία γραφὴ, τίνα δὲ τρόπον προσδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιούμεθα.

That which the holy Scripture hath not said, by what means should we receive, and account it amongst these things that be true? Cyrill would deny all your Ceremonies to speak any thing, but lies; and so would I: Yea, to bring in any thing that is not written, *Basilius* saith, it is ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, *a demonstration of Pride*, and *Origen* in Levit. Hom. 5. *Si quid autem, superfuerit, quod non Divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam debere tertiam Scripturam ad autoritatem scientiæ susciþi (licet)* I think some third Scripture which is neither the old or the New-Testament must be sought to make good the Doctrines, that dumbe humane Ceremonies teach us: 2. *That the blind lead the blinde* is not safe; but it is no Argument to prove that *this is an immutable thing* in policy, that there should be Leaders, and some that are led, except you suppose the Prelates to be the seeing men, and the Pastors and People to be blinde. 3. I utterly deny this consequence: *The Clergy is a great multitude; Ergo*, order necessarily requireth, that by degrees they be distinguished in Prelates and Pastors; for the Prelats are a multitude; *Ergo*, order requireth that one be Pope to command all the rest: The Apostles were a multitude; *Ergo*, There was a necessity of a *Monarch-Apostle*, the Prelaticall Government is Monarchicall; doth order require in all multitude no Government but a Monarchy? Nor do we finde any warrant that *Apostles* had jurisdiction over *Pastors* in the Scripture, nor in any Ecclesiasticall Records; but where Papacy was working; *Paul*, as if he had been to go out of this life, and never to see the faces of the *Elders of Ephesus*, *Act.* 20. 25.

Basil. l. de Fide.

Order requireth not a Monarchical Prelate.

Left

Left unto them as Elders all of equall degrees of power of jurisdiction, the feeding and Governing of the *Church* of *God*, Act. 20. 28,29,30. 4. The particulars of Policy, as *Surplice*, *Crossing* are no more circumstances of Worship then *Aarons Ephod*, a vesture is a circumstance, but a Religious vesture teaching us of Pastorall holinesse, is worship, not a Circumstance: Men can place no Religion in Circumstances.

Hooker, Eccle. Poli. l. 3. p. 125. *It is in vain to argue from Christs office, if there be an immutable Platforme in Scripture, it is as if one should demand a Legacy by vertue of some Written Testament, Wherein there being no such thing Specified; he pleadeth that there it must needs be, and bringeth Arguments from love and good Will, Which alwayes the Testator bore him, imagining that these or the like proofes Will convict a Testament to have that in it, Which other men can no Where by reading finde, its our part to admire What he hath done, rather then to dispute What he in congruity of reason, ought to do: how unsearchable are his judgements?*

How the care and wisdom of Christ proveth, that Christ hath left an unalterable platforme in his testament,

Ans. 1. It is very true, a Platforme of discipline is *questio facti*, A question of Fact, rather then Law; we hear nothing in this comparison, but what Papists with equall strength of reason do bring for their unwritten Traditions; for they say Protestants are to prove a fact and deed of *Jesus Christ*, that he hath left in his written Testament a perfect and immutable Platforme of Doctrine and manners, to which nothing can be added; and this they prove from the care, wisdom and love of *Christ* to his Church, for he ought to reveale his will perfectly, and compleatly in his Scripture, otherwise he hath not the love, care, and wisdom of a Law-giver to his own people, if he leave them in the mist, and in the dark, and write not down all things touching Faith and manners: *Now We can no Where finde by reading Scripture, any thing for the Baptizing of Infants, or a remedy for Women to be cured of Originall sin in the Old-Testament in lieu of circumcision; We finde no Warrant for the Feast of Dedication, in the Law of* Moses, *nor for the dayes of puring, observed by the Iewes, nor for Images, invocation of Saints, Prayer for the dead, the perpetuall Virginity of the Virgin Mary, and many such Doctrines Which the Church believeth.* But we answer, because these vain doctrines (we except the Baptizing of Infants, warranted by

by Scripture) are not in Scripture, they are the vaine and sapleſſe doctrines of men, and will-worſhip: But to preſſe the compariſon, *If any ſhould demand a Legacy by vertue of a Teſtament*, in which the Teſtator hath teſtified his good will, wiſdom, care to his Brethren in ſuch a manner, that he had ſaid; *I have left in my Teſtament to my Brethren, my mind to inſtruct them, for every good worke, to lead them in all truth, to teach them every good way, to underſtand equity, judgement and righteouſneſſe, to cauſe them walke ſafely, ſo that their feet ſhall not ſtumble, and I have left them my word to be a Lamp, and light to their feet in walking*: Then I would inferre from this Teſtament two things: 1. That the love and care of our Teſtator *Chriſt*, ſo revealed, warranteth us to plead for light in *Chriſts* Teſtament, how *to walk in every good way*, and ſo how to walk in all the wayes of the orderly worſhip of God, and of Governing of Gods houſe, by *Paſtors*, *Teachers*, *Elders*, *Deacons*, by their Lawfull calling, qualifications, duties; by the Churches Courts in admonition, excommunication, by the uſe of the keys: 2. Becauſe the Teſtament is perfect to inſtruct in every good way, particularly, and in all duties of worſhip, and this Teſtament forbiddeth all adding and diminiſhing, and ſpeaketh not one word of *Croſſing*, *Cringing*, *and bowing to Altars*, *of wearing of Surplice*: Therefore theſe are not Gods Lawfull wayes, and if I walk in them, I can do nothing but fall and ſtumble: 3. We do not here argue ſimply from the wiſe, and congruous dealing of God, what he ought to do, nor from the love of Chriſt, as a King and head ſimply, but from the love, care and wiſdom of *Chriſt*, as he is ſuch a King and Head, upon whoſe ſhoulder is the whole Government, and upon whom are all the veſſels of the houſe, great and ſmall: 4. It is no leſſe then blaſphemy to aſcribe the not particularizing of Ceremonies, ſuch as *Croſſing*, *Surplice*, *humane Feaſts to the unſearchable Wiſdom, and wayes of God*, to which *Paul*, *Romanes* 11. referreth the great deeps of Supernaturall Providence in Gods Election and Reprobation, his calling of the Gentiles and rejecting of the Iewes; and obſerve (I pray) this conſequence; the wayes of the Lord paſt finding out; *Ergo*, The Lord hath ſet down no Platforme of Church-Policy in his Sons Teſtament; but hath left it to the wiſdom of the Church to deviſe, *Croſſing*, *kneeling to Creatures*, *Surplice*, or ſome ſuch like: But ſince we have a pattern of per-

perfectly formed Churches in the Apostles times, who had power even, *In actu excercito*, of Discipline and Church-worship, and the Apostles mention things of an inferiour nature: How is it that we have no hint of Crossing, Kneeling, Surplice, corner-Cap, nor any such, like unto these? And yet they were as necessary for decency then, 1 *Cor.*5. *Col.*2.5. 1 *Cor.* 11.20. *&c. Rev.*2.1.2,14,18,20, 21. 1 *Cor.*14.40. as now,

Mr. Prynne Truth triumphing over falsehood, p, 113.114.

Others of great learning reply, *that Christ is not the only immediate Head, King, Law-giver, and Governour of the Church, for that is quite contrary to Gods Ordinance in establishing Kings, Magistrates, higher powers, nurse-Fathers, Pastors, Doctors, Elders; for by this, there should be no Kings, Parliaments, Synods, no power of jurisdiction in them to make Lawes, to suppresse and punish all manner of Idolatry, Superstition, Heresies.* But I answer, that Christ is the only immediate Head, King, Law-giver, and Governour of his Church, as upon his shoulder only is the Government, *Isa.9.6.* And *the key of the house of David*, Isa.22.22. And by what right he is the head of all things; and set *above all principalities and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come*; He is the head of the Catholick *Church which is his body, Eph.*1.21,22,23. And he is such a head even in externals, in giving *Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors*, and *Teachers*, who for the *work of the ministery, perfecteth the Saints, in whom the whole body* (of the Church) *is fitly joyned together and compacted by that which every joynt supplieth, according to the effectuall working, in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, to the edifying of it self in love, Ephes.*4.11,12,13,14,15,16. Now these places maketh *Christ* the only immediate head in externals, and internall operation of that body which is the fulnesse of *Christ*: Let any of the Formalists, if *Christ* be not the only immediate Head, Shew us of King or Bishop who is the Mediate, Ministeriall, inferior Head of the Catholick Church, even in externall Government: For *John Hart* in his conference with D. *Roinald*, saith, *Christ is the only principall, imperiall, and invisible Head; but the Pope* (saith he) *is the visible and Ministeriall Head*; So do all *Papists* say; but our Protestant Divines Answer, That it is a repugnancy that a Subject or a Member of the King and Head, should be in any sense both a Subject and a King, a part or Member and a Head;

Collat. Roinal. cum, Io. Hartio. Sect.2.p40 Christ the only immediate King and head, and Law-giver of his Church without any deputy heads or Vicars, D. Roinald. 16.d.41.

Head; and *Roynald* saith, *This name to be Head of the Church is the Royall Prerogative of Jesus Christ*; Yea, the head, in externals, must be with the Catholick body, as Christ hath promised to be with his Church to the end of the world; neither King nor Pope can in the externall Government be with the particular Churches to the end: It is true, the King may be with his Church by his Laws and power; yea, but so may the Pope be, if all Pastors on earth be but his Deputies, and if Pastors be but the Kings Deputies, and sent by the King, so is the King the Head of the Church; but then the Catholick Church hath as many heads, as there be lawfull Kings on earth; But we desire to know, what mediate acts of Law-giving which is essentiall to Kings and Parliaments in civill things, doth agree to Kings, Parliaments, and Synods; Christ hath not made Pastors under-Kings to create any Laws morally obliging the conscience to obedience in the Court of God, which God hath not made to their hand; if the King and Synods only declare and propound, by a power of jurisdiction, that which God in the Law of nature or the written word hath commanded; they are not the Law-makers, nor creators of that morality in the Law, which layeth bonds on the conscience; yea, they have no Organicall, nor inferiour influence in creating that morality, God only by an immediate act as the only immediate King, made the morality, and if King, Parliaments, and Synods, be under Kings and under Law-givers, they must have an under-action, and a Ministeriall subservient active influence under Christ in creating as second causes, that which is the formall reason, and essence of all Lawes binding the conscience, and that is the morality that obligeth the soul to eternal wrath, though King, Parliament, Pastors or Synods, should never command such a Morall thing: Now to propound, or declare, that Gods will is to be done in such an act, or Synodicall Directory or Canon, and to command it to be observed under Civill and Ecclesiasticall paine, is not to make a Law, it is indeed to act authoritatively under Christ as King: but it maketh them neither Kings, nor Law-givers, no more then Heralds are little Kings, or inferiour Law-givers, and Parliaments, because in the name and Authority of King and Parliament they Promulgate the Lawes of King and Parliament: the Heralds are meer servants, and do indeed represent King and Parliament, and therefore to wrong them, in the promulgation of Lawes, is to wrong King and Parliament; but the

Heralds had no action, no hand at all in making the Laws, they may be made when all the Heralds are sleeping, and so by no propriety of speech can Heralds be called *mediat Kings, under-Law-givers*, just so here, as touching the morality of all humane Laws, whether Civill or Ecclesiasticall, God himself immediatly; yea, from Eternity by an Act of his free-pleasure made that without advice of men or Angels, for who instructed him? neither *Moses*, nor Prophet, nor Apostle; yea, all here are *Meri precones*, only Heralds; yet are not all these Heralds who declare the morality of Lawes, equals may declare them *charitative*, *By way of charity* to equals, but these only are to be obeyed as Heralds of Laws, whom God hath placed in Authority, as *Kings, Parliaments, Synods*, the *Church, Masters, Fathers, Captains*; And it followeth no wayes that we disclaime the Authority of all these, because we will not inthrone them in the chaire of the Supreame and only Lawgiver, and head of the Church, they are not under-Law-givers and little Kings to create Laws, the morality of which bindeth the conscience (for this God only can do) *Ergo*, there be no Parliaments, no Kings, no Rulers, that have Authority over men, it is a most unjust consequence; for all our Divines against *Papists*, deny that humane Laws as humane, do binde the conscience; but they deny not, but assert the power of jurisdiction in *Kings, Parliaments, Synods, Pastors*.

SECT. III.

IF *Iesus Christ* be as Faithfull as *Moses* and above him, as the Lord of the house above the servant, *Heb.*3.1,2,3,4. Then as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the Tabernacle, for (saith he) *See thou make all things according to the patterne shewed unto thee in the mount*, *Heb.*8.5. And was not to follow his own spirit, but was to follow the patterne that God shewed him in the Mount, then far lesse hath Christ the *Apostle and high Priest of our Profession* giving us a Platforme of the Church and Government of the New-Testament variable, & shaped according to *the alterable laws, customes & manners of divers nations, for as* Moses though a *Prophet* was not to make one pin of the Tabernacle, but according to the samplar & patern that God did shew him, so Christ manifested to his Disciples, all that he had heard, and seen of the Father, *Ioh.*15. But it is not to be supposed, that the Father shew to *Christ* an *alterable tabernacle* in the *new Testament*, that men might alter, chop and change at their pleasure, *as the customes of Nations are changed*:

5. Arg. As Moses and David were not to follow their own spirit, far lesse is the will of the Church a rule to shape an unalterable Government.

If

If God thought Religion should run a hazard, if the greatest of Prophets (except Christ) might have leave to mold and shape all the Leviticall Service, and Ceremonies; (for as the judicious and Learned Interpreter Mr. *David Dickson* saith, all the Leviticall Service is comprehended under the name of the *Tabernacle*, Exod. 25.40.) according as he pleased, far more should all be corrupted, if erring men, far inferior to *Moses*, Prelats and Pastors, should have leave to draw the Lineaments of the *New Testament*, *Tabernacle*, *Church*, *Service*, *Officers*, *Censures*, and all the Positives of Policie according to no patern shown by Christ; but only the *Fashions*, *alterable Laws*, *Customes*, & forms of nations: Now all the pins of the Tabernacle were but shadows, and Types of Morall and Heavenly things, *Heb.* 8.5. *Heb.* 10.1. *Heb.* 9.9. And they were to be changed and done away by Christ, *Col.* 2.17. *Heb.* 7.12. 2 *Cor.* 3.11. Yet could neither be devised by *Moses*, nor altered by any mortall man, Church or Priests; how can we imagine that men may now devise and set up an alterable and changeable New Testament-frame, *of Prelats*, *Altars*, *Religious dayes*, *Surplice*, *Crossing*, or any the like toyes? And though *David* was a Prophet, and *a man according to Gods heart*; yet in the externals of the Temple, nothing was left to his spirit; he might neither in the least jot adde or omit, 1 *Chron.* 28. 11. *Then* David *gave to* Solomon *his Son, the patern of the Porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the Treasuries thereof, and of the upper Chambers thereof, and of the inner Parlors thereof, & of the place of the Mercy-Seat.* Here be many particulars; But whence had *David* all these? From the patern according to which, *Crosse*, *Surplice*, *Altars*, *and humane Prelats* are shapen? Alas, no; therefore it is added, *v.* 12. *And* (he shewed) *the patern of all that he had by the spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers round about* *v.* 19. *All this* (said *David*) *the Lord made me understand in Writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this patern.* I see no reason to deny, that the form of the Temple was written by the hand of God; as the Ten Commandments were written in two Tables of stone by him; the Text seemeth to say no lesse, ליכשה ילע הכל בכתב מיד יהוה *Pagni, and Ar. Mont.* render it, *Omnia in Scriptura, de manu domini, super me intellegere fecit.* So Jerome, *Omnia venerunt, Scripta manu domini ad me.* Vatablus in notis, *Omnia ista dominus Scripsit manu, suâ et digito, suo ut me familiarius*

Da. Dickson, Expos. Analyti. in Epist. *ad* Heb. c. 8. v. 5.

miliarius doceret: We shall not contend with *Tostatus*, who saith, It might have been written by Angels; though we go not from the letter of the Text, we have from this Papist *Tostatus*, all we desire; for he saith: *We must say that it was not by* Davids *own thought, that he builded all; for* David *durst not build a Temple to the Lord of his own heart; because he knew not if that would please God, but by Divine Revelation:* And therefore the old Translation is corrupt in this, as in many things, which rendreth, *v.* 12. Thus: *Dedit David, Salamoni descriptionem porticus, &c. Nec non et omnium quæ cogitaverat*: As if *Davids* thought had been his guide; for ברוח by the spirit, by *Tostatus*, *Corneli. a Lapide*, *Lyra*, is meant, not *Davids* spirit, but the spirit of Revelation from the Lord; and *Lyra* saith, on *v.* 12. *Per hoc designatur, quod deus pater dedit homini Christo notitiam omnium agendorum in ecclesiâ.* And *Pet. Martyr*, our own Doctor saith, on 1 King. 8. *It cannot be told how unpleasant the institution of new Worship is to God:* And, there should be nothing *in Baptisme but the Word and the Elements; any thing added* (as *Crossing, Oyl, Salt,*) *came from the Prelats: Lavater*, in 1. Par. c. 28. ver. 14. condemneth all additions, even though *Solomon* should have added them, Ezech. 43. 11. *Thou Son of man, shew the house to the house of Israel,*---12. *And if they be ashamed of all that they have done, shew them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the Ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, & all the Laws thereof; And write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, & all the Ordinances thereof, and do them.* Now it is most considerable, that the Form, Fabrick, and Structure of the Temple, *Ezech.* c. 40. *In the visions of God, is shewn to the Prophet by a man*, by Christ the great Angel of the Covenant; who *with a measuring reed of six cubits, measured the Temple*; and in these chapters, c. 40, 41, 42. Christ sheweth to *Ezekiel* all the patern and form which evidently typifieth the *Church of the New Testament, the Bride the Lambs Wife* in the Kingdom of Grace, and glorified in Heaven, revealed by the Angel to *John*, *Rev.* 21. 9, 10, 11. It may be thought that the Porches, Chambers, length and bredth of them East, West, South, and North, the Laws about the Priests, their linnen garments, Sacrifices, washing and the like, are of lesse concernment then the Doctrine of Christs nature, person, offices of Faith, Repentance, Iudgement,

Pagni, Ari. Mont. Vatablus in notis, *Tostatus* in 1 *Chron.* 18. 19. 2. 7. *Ista Scriptura tam poterat fieri per Angelos quam per deum. Tostatus*, Q. 1. ibid. Cornel. a Lapide, com. 1. Paralip. 29. 19. *Deus ergo in tabula descripsittotam ideam, Templi alioqui declinatio â Davide vix intelligi potuisset.* Degrees de Templ. Ded. p. 73. Lavater, *Ex eo quod, edificium et vasa secundum formam sibi ostensam facere debuit, significatur in cultu dei non secundum humanam rationem, sed ver-*

Iudgement, Heaven &c. And therefore being not so necessary, nor so weighty; there was no necessity that all the like Positive externals of Church-Policie, written to a rude and carnall people, should be written to us, who are now more spirituall, and upon whom the day-spring from above doth shine, the shadows now being past; and who have greater liberty then they had, who were as children under Tutors. *Ans.* 1. I do not deny, but all Ceremonials are of lesse weight then the Morals; but the question is, if they be of lesse Divine authority, so as we may devise of our own Spirit such Ceremonials, and may alter, omit, or remove these, or any new Ceremonials in the Sacraments under the New Testament; for *New Testament* Ceremonials, as to take Bread, Eat and drink, are not so necessary, nor so weighty to us under the New-Testament, as the precept of believing in Christ, and *of repentance from dead works*, yet I hope it shall be a weak inference, from thence to infer, we may therefore alter and change any thing of the Sacrament, for the same Christ who commanded us to believe in him, said also, *Drink ye all of this*; and if we may not remove drinking from the last Supper, because injoyned by Christ upon the authority of the Law-giver, as signifying the spirituall drinking of Christs Blood, how can any dare to adde Crossing to Baptisme, which signifieth the dedication of the Baptized to Christs service? But 1. Divine Ceremonials, and positives which were to be changed, have these notes and impressions of God, which Surplice, Crosse in Baptisme, Corner-cap, (which by Analogie answereth to *Moses* his Ceremonies) hath not; and yet if they be of the New Testament, and so of a more excellent spirits devising then the people of the Iews were capable of, in regard of their Bondage under Carnall Precepts, they ought to have them in a more excellent manner: As 1. In regard of the manner of Revelation; all the Laws and Ceremoniall Ordinances were revealed to *Moses* when he was forty dayes in the Mount with God, and was in Heaven and above men, *Exod.* 25. 40. *Heb.* 8. 5. The length measure and patern of the Temple was revealed to *Ezechiel* when *he was in the Spirit*, and *saw the Visions of God*, *Ezech.* 40. 2, 3. *And a Writing of the form of the Temple by Gods hand, was delivered to David*, 1 Chro. 28. 19. Now if a more free and glorious spirit teach the Positives of policy, under the New-Testament, such as Surplice, Crossing, then Prelates

bum dei agendum esse, quo patefecit quomodo colivellit. Si Salomon suas imaginationes fuisset sequitus Templum aliâ formâ construxisset, vasa aliter feciſſet et plura quam deus prescripserat.

Ceremonials of Moses his Law, are of lesse weight then Morals, but not of lesse divine authority.

Two notes of Divinity ought to be in the New Testament Ceremonials, which were in Divine Ceremonies.

lates must be in a higher mount with God, then *Moses* was, and in a deeper extasie of the visions of God, then *Ezechiel* was in, *Ezec.* 40.1,2,3. When they are in the childe-birth pain of devising, and bring forth such defaced and dirty whelpes, as *Surplice, Crossing, Altars, &c.* 1. I should think it blasphemy so to think: 2. In regard of the Doctrine revealed: When I read the 40,41,42. Chapters of *Ezekiel* touching the forme of the Temple, and the Antitipe, Chapters the Revelation, c.21. c.22. Yea, and the very Ceremoniall Laws of *Moses*, as the scape-goats going to the wildernesse with the sins of the people of God, and all the rest of the Lawes that pointeth at Christ to be slain for us, and the heavenly mysteries of the *Gospel* explained especially in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*: when I read these, I finde a strong smell of the ointments of a precious Redeemer, the extream love of God to man: the Majesty, the divinity and efficacy of divine power in these, as in other Scriptures: But should our Prelats, put in Print by the spirit of the new Testament, some *Epistles* touching Ceremonies in Generall, or of Surplice, Corner-cap, Crossing, and their heavenly relation to the mysteries of the Gospel in particular, I should not think men would dare to say a nobler spirit speaketh like God and heaven in these then in the other.

It is without all Warrant to expound Christian Liberty of a power of devising a mutable Church-Policy, and lawes not warranted in Gods word, seeing Christian Liberty expresly exempteth us altogether from obedience to mens Laws not warranted by *Christs* word, *Gal.*5.1. *Col.*2.20, *&c.*

Eccles. Policy, book 3. pag. 122.

Let us hear what *Hooker* saith, for his mutable Policie under the New Testament: *Christ is not lesse faithfull then Moses, because Moses delivered to the Iewes some Lawes that were durable, and Christ some Laws that are changeable, otherwayes by this reason* Christ *shall be lesse faithfull then* Moses; *for* Moses *erected in the wildernesse a Tabernacle, which was moveable from place to place*; Solomon *a stately Temple, which was not moveable: Therefore* Solomon *was faithfuller then* Moses, *which no man indued with reason will think:* Christ *was faithfull*, and saith, *I have given to them the words that thou gavest me: He concealed not any part of his Fathers will: But did any part of that will require the immutability of Laws concerning Church-Policy?*

How Moses doing all according to the pattern proveth an immutable platforme.

Ans. I

Anſ. I anſwer, as Chriſt did to the Jews in another caſe, *Ioh.6.* 32. *Moſes gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you that true bread*: So in this, neither *Moſes* nor *Solomon* erected either that Tabernacle or Temple, as Law-givers, but the Father of our Lord Ieſus, as the true Law-giver: Now both were but meer ſervants and Heralds in all that they did, for God ſhewed to *Moſes* the pattern of the Tabernacle, and to *David* and *Solomon* the forme of the Temple, in all the pins, rings, chambers, cubits, length and breadth, *Exod.*24 40. 1 *Chron.*28.11,19. And the queſtion is not if ever the Lord himſelf delivered mutable or immutable Laws, either in Doctrine or Policy: We grant he did, and may deliver Laws changeable and to indure for a time only in both the old and new Teſtament, *Heb.*7.18. *Col.*2.17. *Act.*15.28,29. But the queſtion is, if *Moſes* as a man, if Chriſt as a man only, if the Church of Prelates, yea, or of Lawfull Officers can be faithfull, if they deliver lawes to the Church, which may be altered, without the expreſſe will of God, ſpeaking in his word at the pleaſure of men, and which are poſitives of worſhip and Policy, ſuch as humane Prelates, *Surplice*, Croſſe, &c. which varieth, dieth and liveth, falleth and riſeth with the climate, Nation, *civill-Government*, *Lawes*, *Manners*, and *cuſtomes of People*; and this is all one, as to move the queſtion, whither the Ambaſſadour as a man, may alter the Articles of his Commiſſion, according to his own private luſt, without an expreſſe and evident Warrant of the Prince and State, whoſe ſervant and Meſſenger he is in all that he doth, and if he be a faithfull Ambaſſadour, who doth his own will, and not the will of thoſe that ſent him, and if Chriſt be as faithfull as *Moſes*, if he had given Laws of policy under the New-Teſtament to be altered without an expreſſe and evident Warrant from the will of the Father, at the pleaſure and will of men? This we deny; and certainly, ſay that *Moſes* had erected a changeable Tabernacle at the will of man, and *Solomon* a Temple unchangeable at the will, and expreſſe Commandment of God, then had *Solomon* been faithfuller then *Moſes*; our Arguments nerves do not conſiſt in the immutability, or the mutability of things themſelves, or of the Laws, but on the immutability or mutability of things poſitive, or Laws poſitive, under this reduplication, ſo as they be immutable or mutable at the pleaſure and will of men, without and beſide the word of God, ſuch as Croſſe and

and Surplice, and such like Romish stuffe are pretended to be. 2. Certain it is, that Christ concealed not any part of his Fathers will, *Ioh.*17.8. But delivered all, and this place, with the place, Ioh.15.15. We urge against the traditions of *Papists*, and say, because Christ spake nothing from his Father either in his own person, or his Apostles in the *New-Testament*, or in the old by *Moses* and the Prophets, of invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Worshipping of Images, and Reliques and the rest of their unwritten Traditions, these being positives of worship, and more then unseparable, and connaturall attendants, such as are common, Time, Place, Person, Name, Country, Habite, Gesture, are therefore unlawfull, because Christ neither heard them of the Father, nor spake them to the Apostles, and just the like say we of *Surplice*, *Crosse*, &c. That they are no part of the will of God, which the Father revealed to *Christ*, and these same Texts *Papists* use, to prove that the Scriptures are not perfect, because they speak nothing of the Traditions of the *Church*; so *Bellarmine*, *Because the Counsell of* Trent, Andradius, Stapleton, and all the rest, and they prove as well, if Crosse and Surplice, and humane Offices, as Prelates, stand good and lawfull, that yet the Scriptures are unperfect: 3. We say that the whole will of God revealed by the Father to Christ, and by Christ to the Prophets and Apostles, requireth the *immutability of all Laws of Church-Policy* in this sence, that men should not dare to make and unmake, erect, command, alter, and injoyne positive Laws, of doctrine or policy at their pleasure.

Hooker, ibid. p.113. *There is more reason to say that God hath a lesse care of the Church under the New-Testament, then under the Old; then a Philosopher had to say, because God hath provided better for beasts that are born with hornes, skins, hair and garments by nature, then man who is born without these, that therefore nature is a carefull mother to beasts, and a hard-hearted Step-dame to man: for Gods affection consisteth not in these, for even herein shineth his Wisdom, that though the wayes of his providence be many, yet the end which he bringeth all at the length unto, is one and the self same: yea, it should follow that because God hath not prescribed Rites, and Laws of civill Policy to us, as to the Iews, that he hath lesse love to us, and lesse care of our Temporall estate in the world then of theirs.*

Ans. 1. Its true indeed, God should have lesse care of man, who

is

is born naked, then of beasts born with hair in lieu of garments, if God had not given reason to man according to which by nature, he may provide garments for himself, and the comparison should go aptly on four feet, God should have lesse love, and should declare lesse love to some of mankinde, if he gave some naturall reason to devise a Bible and a Religion of their own that they might walk to heaven in the *light of a fire of their own kindling*, without the Scriptures of God (which is a false supposition) and if he had denied reason to another part of mankinde, surely all would say, God had so far forth been more carefull of the salvation of the former, as he should have willed their salvation, and loved those in a higher measure to whom he gave reason on these termes, and should have been lesse carefull of the salvation of those to whom he denied reason, as he he had no more created such capable of salvation and of his love for the saving of them, then brute beasts are: and this answer layeth down a ground that naturall reason is sufficient without the light of Scripture to guide us in all these things of policy that are alterable, then (say I) God did take a great deal of needlesse and superfluous pains in setting down so many particular Laws of Ceremonies and Civill Policy, for the Iews, if with the help of reason, they might have steerd their course to Christ and salvation, by the help of the star light of reason, as a man though born naked may by help of reason, make shift for garments to infants, which beasts void of reason cannot do: for thus the comparison must run, and it shall be indeed a cavilling at Gods wisdom, as Papists do, calling the Scriptures inky Divinity: 2. The word of God maketh it a great love of God, and a work of Free-grace, that *the great things of Gods Law are written to Ephraim*, *Hos.*8.12. And their sin the greater, that they should *dare to multiply Altars*, *v.*11. without warrant of Gods word, as Formalists multiplied, Altars, Saints-dayes, Surplices, &c. And it is an act of singular love, that God gave his judgements, Word, and Statutes, even of Ceremonies, and policy *to Israel and Iacob, and did not so to every Nation*, Psal. 149.19,20. *Ezek.*20.11,12,13. This was Israels excellency above all Nations on earth, *Deut.*4.6. *Deut.*20.33. *Rom.*3.1,2. *Rom.*9.4. that God gave them particular Lawes, Iudgements, Statutes, not only in Morals, but also in Ceremonials, and Policy: yet *Hooker* dare say, *We may not measure the affection of God towards us, by*

Gods care for us leadeth us to think he hath given us a better guide then naturall reason, in all Positive Morals of Church-Policie.

Theologia, Atramentaria.

such differences. 3. It shall not hence follow God hath a greater love to the Iews then to us, because he gave them Laws, *concerning civill policy, which he gave not to us.* Except the Lord had given us power to make civill Laws, which laid Morall obligation on our consciences, even in civill things, which morality He expressed in particular Laws written to them, and not to us, as *Formalists* teach, for then he hath left us in Moralls, to the darkenesse of naturall reason, in which condition we could not but erre and sin, and make that morally good and obligatory of conscience, which is morally evil, for reason knoweth not what is positive Morally good, except the light of Gods Word teach us; and in Morals, such as judiciall Laws were to the *Jews*, the Lord should have been more carefull in his particular directing of them, then of us, and more tender to have them preserved from the sin of will-worship, then us, which cannot consist with the Dispensation of lesse light; greater obscurity in regard of types and shadows toward them, and of the Day-light of the Gospel, and the arising of the Day-star, and *the filling of the earth with knowledge of the Lord toward us*, under the New Testament: But the comparison must go upon this supposition, that the Lord purposed to make Politick Laws in their Positives, Morall and Obligatory of the Conscience of the *Jews*, and the Civill Laws of the Gentiles under the New Testament in their Positives (such as is not to carry Armour in the night, and the like) not to be Morall nor Obligatory of the Conscience. But as touching that which is Morall in all Civill Laws, the Lord is as carefull of our Temporall state, as of theirs, in condescending to particularize all Morals to us, as well as to them.

Book of Eccles. Policie, 3. pag. 113, 114.

Hooker, *That Christ did not mean to set down particular Positive Laws for all things, in such sort as* Moses *did; the very different manner of delivering the Laws of* Moses *and the Laws of* Christ, *doth plainly shew,* Moses *had Commandement to gather the Ordinances of God together distinctly, and orderly to set them down according to their kindes, for each Publique duty and Law: But the Laws of Christ we rather finde mentioned by occasion in the Writings of the Apostles, then any solemn thing directly written to comprehend them in a Legall sort.* 1. *The Law Moral and Ceremonial were not delivered one & the same way; the former was uttered by the Voice of God, in the hearing of six hundred thousand.* 2. *Written with Gods finger.* 3. *Termed a Co-*

venant.

venant. 4. *Given to be kept without time, how long, or place where. The latter not so, and restricted to the Land of* Jury, Deut. 4.5. 12. Deut. 5.22. *And if God had respect in Positive Laws, to time and place, and the Manners of that Nation, seeing Nations are not all alike, then the giving of one kinde of Positive Laws unto one only people, without any Liberty to alter them, is but a slender proof, that therefore one kinde should be given to serve everlastingly for all. Ans.* This Argument reduced to form, shall want both matter, and form, and reason. *If the Laws of* Moses *be distinctly and orderly set down, and gathered together according to their severall kindes for each Duty; and the Laws of* Christ *be occasionally only written; then* Christ *did not mean to set down particular Positive Laws, for all things in such sort as* Moses *did. But this difference is true, Ergo, &c.* Both the Major Proposition and the Assumption are false, and neither of them can be proved: For the occasionall writing of some Articles of Faith, and of Dogmaticall points, should then prove that Christ meant not to set down all Articles of Faith particularly; for Christ, *Matth.* 22. upon occasion of the *Saduces* tempting; *Paul*, upon occasion of some at *Corinth* who denied the Resurrection, 1 *Cor.* 15. And of some that *mourned for the dead*, 1 *Thess.* 4. Set down and proved an Article of Faith, to wit, the Resurrection of the dead: By this Argument the Scripture is not full and perfect, in Fundamentals, as *Moses* is in Ceremonials, but hath left such and such Fundamentals to be altered, added or omitted by the Church, in that way, that *Surplice, Crosse, and Altars*, are alterable things. Most of Dogmatick points concerning Christs sufferings, are occasionall, as his taking, his betraying by *Judas*, who knew the place he was in, the valuing of him *at Thirty pieces*, the giving *him Gall and Vinegar*, a punishment not intended by the Iudge, but occasionall, in that Christ said he thirsted; Yea, the *Crucifying* of him rather then *Barrabas*, upon occasion of the malice of the people, when *Pilate* had scourged him upon a Policie, to see if the people would demand he might be released, *the casting Lots for his garment*, the *Crucifying of him between two Theeves*, the not breaking of his bones upon occasion he was dead, the piercing of his side; all which in regard of second causes, were occasionall, and so though Dogmaticall and Doctrinall, these must be all such alterable and Ambulatory points of Doctrine, as the *Church* and *Prelats* may

The occasionall writing of things in Scripture, no reason why they are alterable.

change at their godly discretion, and Christ meant *not in these, to set down particular Positive Laws in such sort as* Moses *did.* Yea, the Evangel according to *Luke*, is set forth occasionally; *because many have taken in hand to set forth in order a Declaration of these things which are most firmly believed; therefore it seemed good to* Luke *also to write*, Luk. 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. Upon occasion of *Onesimus* his fleeing from his master; *The Epistle to Philemon* was written upon occasion of the unconstancy of the *Galathians*, whose faith was perverted by false teachers, that of Iustification by Faith, without the works of the Law: And the Epistle to the *Galathians* was written, most, if not all the Canonick Epistles were written either upon occasion of false Teachers, or for fear they should be scandalized at *Pauls* bonds. By this vain Argument, the most part of *Canonick Scripture* should be alterable, imperfect, not particular in most Doctrinals, no lesse then in Ceremonials; And so the Major Proposition is most false, for its a vain thing to Collect Christs meaning, to set down particulars of either Doctrine or Ceremonies, from occasions of Providence; for most of the Scripture is penned upon occasions from men, and from second causes, shall these things leave off to be of Divine Institution, that hath their rise from occasions, even sinfull occasions? Yea, the death of Christ is occasioned from mans fall in sin. What then? Is it an alterable Doctrine left to the determination of the Church that Christ died? But this is no other then the shift of *Papists* for their unwritten Tradition. Sanderus de Visib. Monarch. Lib. 1. c. 5. pag. 13. *Si ergo per solas conscriptas leges dei civitas gubernaretur in valdè magnâ parte eorum que passim contingunt, quid faceret, nesciret, quia legem de his loquentem non haberet; Imo si tantum una Lex toti reipub: necessaria esse posset, eaque ipsa scriberetur a prudentissimis viris, ac singulis annis ab orbe condito novæ interpretationes eidem adderentur: tamen nunquam eveniret, ut ea lex tam plenè interpretata foret, quin causæ novæ possent intervenire, ob quas lex et legis interpretatio novam iterim postularet interpretationem, adeo et fœcunda est natura in suis eventis, et Angustum ingenium humanum, et varia Iurisperitorum sententia, et verba tum pauca, tum ambigua.* All cometh to this, that this *Papist* saith, That there cannot be one written unchangeable Law that is necessary for the whole Church, for new events, occasions and occurences of Providence, should so change the case, that there should be a necessity of a new interpre-

Papists pretend that things are not written in the word, because of the various occurrences of Providence.

interpretation, and of a new Law. 2. Nor can we say that Laws made upon occasion, as that Law of transferring the inheritance to the Daughter, made upon occasion of the Daughters of *Zelophehad*, are in this sense occasionall, that the Iews might at their pleasure alter, or change a Law made by God, and substitute one of their own in place thereof; for then might the Iews change all the Ceremonies and Iudgements that God gave them for a time and occasionally: Now then they might have abolished Circumcision, the passeover, and substitute other Sacraments in their place, for these Sacraments were not given by Gods own voice. 2. Nor written by Gods own finger. Nor, 3. Are they termed a Covenant, in that sense that the Morall Law is termed a Covenant. 4. Nor are they given without limitting of time and place, expresly when and where: Now if the Church of the Iews could change Sacraments at their pleasure, because their Sacraments were no part of the Eternall Law Morall, they might alter all Gods Law, as the Church may alter *Surplice*, *Crossing*; and I see not, but the Church of the New Testament upon the same ground, may alter the Sacraments of the New Testament. *Papists*, as *Vasquez Becanus*, and others say, that neither the Pope nor the Church can adde or devise a new Article of Faith: Yet doth *Horantius* Loco Catholico. l. 2. c. 11. fol. 129. teach, That *Christ hath not taught us all fully in the New Testament, but that the holy Spirit, shall to the end of the World, teach other new things as occasion shall require*: And this he bringeth as an Argument to prove, that *there must be unwritten Traditions, not contained in Scripture*; even as the *Formalists* contend for unwritten Positives of Church-Policie.

Horantius Loc. Com. lib. 2. c. 11. fol. 129. *Quæcunque audict, loquetur, & que futura sunt, annunciabit vobis, quasi diceret, Quotiescunque rei occasio fuerit, revelabit vobis. Quæ e re vestra esse viderit, suggerit, ac quoties revelare expedierit.* l. 2. c. 12. fol. 132. *Sed quis non videat multa verbo esse tradita, quæ Ecclesiæ solum memoriæ, & multius nimirum Scriptis sunt mandata?*

3. Morals of the Law of nature and the Morall Law, do more respect occasions of Providence, customes, Laws, and the manners of people (they doing so nearly concerne our Morall practise) then any Ceremonies of *Moses* his Law which did shadow out *Christ* to us, and therefore this reason shall prove the just contrary of that for which its alledged; for the Morali Law should be rather alterable at the Churches lust, then Ceremonials, for there be far more occurrences of Providence in regard of which the Laws Morall touching, what is Sabbath breaking, whether is leading an Ox to the water on the Sabbath a breach of the Sabbath? (the Iews held the affirmative, *Christ* the negative) touching obedience to Superior,

periors, Homicide, Polygamie, Incest, Fornication, Oppression, Lying, Equivocating: Then there can be occasions to change the Law of sacrificing, which clearly did adumbrat *Christ*, who was to be offered as a sacrifice for the sins of the world; yea, all significant Symbolicall Ceremonies have their spirituall signification independent from all occasions of Providence, and depending on the meer will of the Instituter; Surplice, or white linnen, signifieth the Priests holinesse, without any regard to time, place, or nationall customes; for *Christ* might have made an immutable Law, touching the Symbolicall, and Religious signification, and use of *Saints-dayes*, *White linnen*, *Crossing*, and all the rest of humane Ceremonies, which should stand to *Christs* second coming, notwithstanding of any occurrences of Providence, no lesse then he made an immutable Law, touching the Sacramentall obsignation of water in Baptisme, and of Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, if it had not been his will never to burden his *Churches* with such dumb and tooth-lesse mysteries as humane positives: 4. The assumption is false, for divers Ceremoniall Laws now altered were made without any regard to occasions of Providence, and many Doctrinals that are unalterable were made with speciall regard to such occurrences: 5. If positives of Policy be alterable, because the occasions of such are alterable by God; it shall follow that God who hath all revolutions of Providence in his hand, must change these Positives, and not the Authority of the Church: and thus Doctrinals are alterable by God, not by men, which is now our question; for Christ hath given a Commandment; *Take ye, Eat ye, Drink ye all of this:* Yet hath he not tyed us in the time of persecution to conveen in publick, and Celebrate the Lords Supper; but the *Church* doth not then change the Law, nor liberate us from obedience to a Command given by God, but *God* liberateth us himself.

Hooker, 3. Book, pag. 114, 115.

Hooker. *But that which most of all maketh to the clearing of this point, is, that the Iews who had Laws so particularly determining, and so fully instructing them in all affairs what to do, were notwithstanding continually inured with causes exorbitant, and such as their Laws had not provided for, and so for one thing, which we have left to the order of the Church; they had twenty which were undecided by the expresse Word of God; so that by this reason, if we may devise one Law, they may devise twenty: Before the Fact of the sons of Shelomith, there*

Was

was no Law that did appoint any punishment for blasphemers, nor what should be done to the man that gathered sticks on the Sabbath. And by this means God instructed them in all things from heaven, what to do: Shall we against experience think that God must keep the same, or a course by Analogy answering thereunto with us as with them? Or should we not rather admire the various and harmonious dissimilitude of Gods wayes in guiding his Church from age to age; Others would not only have the Church of the Iews a pattern to us, but they would (as learned Master *Prynne* with them saith) take out of our hand the *Apostolick Church*, that it should be no rule to us; for saith he, *There was no Uniforme Church-government in the Apostles times, at the first they had only Apostles and Brethren*, Acts 1.13. *no Elders, or Deacons: Their Churches increasing, they ordained Deacons*, Act. 6. *And long after the Apostles ordained Elders in every Church, after that Widowes in some Churches, not at all. In the primitive times some Congregations had Apostles*, Acts 4.11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 12.4. to 33. *Evangelists, Prophets, Workers of miracles, Healers, &c. Other Churches at that time had none of these Officers or Members, and all Churches have been deprived of them since those dayes.* Ans. 1. What *Hooker* saith, is that which *Bellarmine, Sanderus, Horantius*, and all Papists say, for their *Traditions* against the perfection of the word, to wit, that the word of God, for 2373. years *between Adam and Moses* (saith *Horantius*) was not written, so *Turrianus, Bellarmine*, and the reason is just nothing, to say *the Jews might devise twenty Laws, where we may devise one; because the Jews were continually inured with causes exorbitant, such as their written Laws had not provided for.* This must be said which is in question, and so is a begging of the controversie, that the Iews of their own head, and *Moses* without any speciall word from God, or without any pattern shown in the mount, might devise what Laws they pleased; and might punish the blasphemer, and the man that gathered sticks on the Sabbath, and determine, without God, the matter of the Daughters of *Zelophehad*, as the *Formalists* teach, that the Church without any word of God or pattern from the word, may devise humane Ceremonial Prelats, Officers of Gods house shapen in a shop on earth, in the Antichrists head, and the Kings Court, the Surplice, the Crosse in Baptisme, and the like. Now we answer both them and Papists with one answer, that it is true, there was no written

Horantius, loc. Catho. Lib. 2. c. 12 fol. 131. *Turrian.* to. de fide, spe. et Charit, disp. 20. dub. 2. *Bellarm.* de Verb dei non script. l. 4. c. 3. That there was no Vniform Platform of Government in the time of Moses and the Apostles, is no Argument that there is none now.

ten Scripture between *Adam and Moses which was some thousands of years*: Yea, nor a long time after till God wrote the *Law on Mount Sinai*: But withall, what God spake in visions, dreams, and apparitions to the Patriarchs, was as binding and obliging a pattern interditing men then to adde the visions of their own brain to what he spake from heaven, as the written word is to us, so that the Iews might neither devise twenty Laws nor any one of their own head, without expresse warrant of Gods immediate Tradition, which was the same very will and truth of God, which *Moses* committed to writing; if then *Formalists* will assure us of that which *Papists* could never assure us, we shall receive both the unwritten Traditions of the one, and the unwritten Positive inventions of *Crosse and Surplice*, devised by the other: as 1. Make us sure, as God himself immediatly spake to the Patriarchs, and to *Moses*, nothing but what after was committed to writing by *Moses* and the *Prophets* at Gods speciall Commandment, as *Papists* say, their unwritten Traditions *are agreeable to the Word, and though beside Scripture, yet not against it*: And the very will of God no lesse then the written word; and let *Formalists* assure us, that their positive additaments of Surplice and Crosse are the same which God commandeth in the Scriptures, by the Prophets and Apostles, *and though beside, yet not contrary to the vvord:* But I pray you what better is the distinction of *beside the vvord, not contrary to the vvord of God*, out of the mouth of *Papists*, *to maintain unvvritten Traditions*, which to them is the expresse word of God, then out of the mouth of *Formalists*, for their unwritten Positives, which are worse then Popish Traditions in that they are not the expresse word of God, by their own grant? 2. Let the *Formalist* assure us, that after this, some *Moses* and *Elias* shall arise and write Scripture touching the *Surplice* and *Crosse*, that they are the very minde of *God*, as the Lord could assure the Church between *Adam* and *Moses*, that all Divine truths which he had delivered by Tradition, should in Gods due time be written in Scripture, by *Moses*, the *Prophets* and *Apostles*: I think they shall here fail in their undertakings. Hence the Argument standeth strong, the *Jevvs* might devise nothing in doctrine, Worship, or Government; nay, neither the *Patriarchs* nor *Moses*, nor the *Prophets* of their own head, without Gods immediate Tradition, or the written Scripture (which are all one)

Ergo,

Ergo, Neither can the Church, except she would be wiser then God in the Scriptures. 2. Hookers *Various and Harmonious Dissimilitude of Gods guiding his Church*, is his fancy: This variety we admire, as it is expressed, *Heb.* 1. 1. But *Hooker* would say (for he hath reference to that place) *God at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, and now to us by his Son: But last of all, he hath revealed his Will by the* Pope *of* Rome, *and his cursed Clergy, that we should Worship Images, pray to Saints, and for the dead, beleeve Purgatory, &c. and now by humane Prelates, he hath shown his will to us, touching Crossing, Surplice*: Now *Papists*, as *Horantius*, *Sanderus*, *Malderus*, *Bellarmine*, and others say, Most of the points that are in Question between them and Protestants, and particularly *Church-Ceremonies*, are unwritten Traditions delivered by the Church; beside the warrant of Scripture. 3. We grant that there was no Uniform Church-Government in the *Apostles time*, *Deacons were not at the first*, *Elders were not ordained* κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *in every Church*: But this is nothing *against a Platform of Uniform Government, which cannot be altered in Gods Word.* For by this reason the Learned and Reverend Mr. *Prynne*, because points of Government did grow by succession of time, cannot infer therefore that Government which the immediately inspired Apostles did ordain in Scripture, is alterable by men; then because, 1. Fundamentals of Faith and Salvation, were not all delivered at first by God; there is no Uniform, no unalterable Platform of Doctrinals and Fundamentals set down in Scripture. For first, the Article of Christs death and incarnation, was obscurely delivered to the Church in Paradise: Sure the Article of Christs making his Grave with the wicked, of his being put to death for our Transgressions, though he himself was innocent; his justifying of many by Faith, were after delivered by *Isaiah*, Chap. 53. And by succession of time, many other Fundamentals, as the Doctrine of the written Moral Law, in the Moral Positives thereof, were delivered to the Church: But I hope from this successive Addition of Fundamentals, no man can infer, 1. There is no Uniform Platform of the doctrine of Faith, set down in the Old Testament. 2. None can hence infer, because all points Fundamental were not delivered to the Church at first; therefore the Church, without any expresse warrant from God, may alter the Platform of Fundamentals of Faith, as they take

Horantius, in loc. Catholic. l. 2. c. 12. fol. 131.

Sanderus, de visib. Monarch. l. 1. c. 5. p. 13.

Malderus, in 22. de virtu. Theolog. q. 1. de Object. fidei tract. de trad. q. unic. dub. 1.

Fundamentals were by succession delivered to the church, yet are they not alterable.

on them to adde *Surplice, Crossing, &c.* and many other Positives to the Government of Christ without any expresse warrant of the Word. 3. Our Argument is close mistaken, we argue not from the Patern of Government, which was in the Apostles times, at the laying of the first stone in that Church; then the Apostolike Church had indeed no Officers; but the Apostles and the seventy Disciples we reason not from one peece, but from the whole frame, as perfected by the Ministery of the Lords Apostles. 2. We argue not from the *Apostolike Church*, as it is such a *Church*; for Apostles were necessary then, as was community of goods, miracles, speaking with tongues, *&c.* but we draw an argument from the *Apostolike Church*; as the first *Christian Church*, and since the Law *was to come from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem*, Isai. 2. 3. And the *Lord was to reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem before his Ancients gloriously*, Isai. 24. 23. And the *Lord was to reign over his people in Mount Zion, from henceforth and for ever*, Micah 4. 2, 7. And Christ for that gave a special command to his Disciples, *not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which they had heard from Christ*; therefore this *Church* of *Jerusalem* was to be a rule, a patern and copy for the Government of the Visible Kingdom and *Church* of *Christ*, in which *Christ* was to reign by his own Word and Law, *Mic.* 4. 2, 7. And so the Spirit descended upon the Apostles in the framing and Governing of the first *Church*, in so far, as it was a *Christian Church*, and they were to act all, not of their own heads, but as the Holy Ghost led them in all Truth, in these things that are of perpetual necessity; and in such as these, the first *Church* is propounded as imitable: Now we do not say in Apostles, which had infallibility of writing Canonick Scripture, in Miracles, speaking with Tongues, and such likes that agreed to the *Apostolike Church*, not as a *Church*, but as such a determinate *Church* in relation to these times, when the Gospel and Mystery of God, now manifested in the flesh, was new taught, and never heard of before, did require Miracles, gift of Tongues, that the Gospel might openly be preached to the Gentiles, we do not (I say) urge the *Apostolike Church* and all the particulars for Government in it, for a rule and patern to be imitated. And if Master *Prynne* deny, that there is an Uniform Government in the Apostles

The church of Ierusalem as perfected in Doctrine, and Discipline, is our patern. Acts 1. 4.

times,

times, because God himself added to them Deacons & Elders, which *at first they had not*, & removed *Apostles, miracles, gifts of healing, and tongues*: then say I; First, the Canonick Scripture is not Uniform and perpetual: Why, for certainly once there was no Canonick Scripture but the Books of *Moses*, and after the holy Ghost added the Book of the Psalmes, and the Prophets; and after the Nativity and Ascension of our Lord to Heaven, the *Apostles* did write Canonick Scripture: I hope, this is but a poor Argument to infer, that there is no Vniform and unalterable Platform of Divinity in the Old and New Testament, and yet the Argument is as concludent the one way, as it is the other: 3. We do not so contend for an Vniform and unalterable Platform of *Church-Government* in the Word; as it was not free to the Lord and Law-giver to adde, and alter at his pleasure, only we hold it so Vniform and unalterable, that this Platform is not shaped like a coat to the Moon, or alterable at the will of men, without expresse warrant of the Lords Word, and to rise and fall with the climate, and the elevation of Nationall customes; and therefore the Argument is nothing concludent, and judge what can be made of these words of the learned Mr. *Prynne*: *The Government and Officers of all Churches, not being* De facto, *one and the same in all particulars in the very Primitive times, as well as since, it can never be proved to be of Divine right, and the self same in all succeeding Ages, without the least variation, since it was not so in the Apostles dayes*: For this is all one as to say, the Canonick Scripture was not one and the same, in the *Apostles* and *Prophets* times, but admitted of divers additions; *Ergo*, now in our daies Canonick Scripture is not one and the same, but may also suffer the like additions: 2. Because God himself added to Canonick Scripture, and to the Government of the *Church* in the *Apostles* dayes; *Ergo*, men may without Warrant from God, adde in our dayes to Canonick Scripture, and to the Government and Officers of the Church: 3. The Government and Officers in the Apostles time were not of Divine right, but alterable by God; *Ergo, Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, Workers of miracles* were not of Divine right in the *Apostles* times, but might have been altered by men, without the expresse Warrant of God: But will any wise man believe that *Pauls* Apostleship was alterable, and might be changed by the Church? Since he saith, *Gal.* 1. 1. *Paul an Apostle,*

Mr. *Prynne*, Truth Triumphing, &c. p. 128.

not of men, neither by men, but by Iesus Christ, and 1 Cor. 12. 28. When *Paul* saith, *And God hath set ἔθετο, or instituted some in the Church; first, Apostles, secondly, Prophets, thirdly, Teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, &c.* and Eph. 4. 11. *When Christ ascended on high, he gave some Apostles, some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some to be Pastors and Teachers,* 12. *For the perfecting of the Saints, &c.* Can it enter into the head of any man to say, some Churches had *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, and *Pastors, and miracles, and some not*; *Ergo, Apostles*, and *Pastors*, are not by Divine right; *Ergo*, because they were not in all *Churches*, therefore they were alterable at the will of men? and a Surplice, and Crosse in Baptisme hath as much of Divine institution, as the calling of the *Apostle*, or of a *Pastor*, and truly to me, it is bold Divinity to say, that Pastors set *over the flock by the holy Ghost*, Act. 20. 28. and whose due qualifications are so specified, 1 *Tim.* 3. and Elders, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. and Teachers placed by God in the Church, 1. *Cor.* 12 28. may be all turned out of the Church, by men, as having no Divine right to be there, and that men may set up other alterable Officers in their place; for by this reason the *Apostles*, by that ordinary spirit, that is now in *Church-Rulers*, might without their *Apostolick spirit*, or any immediate Warrant from Christ, have altered the whole frame of Apostolick-Government, and Church-Officers, as the *Church* may upon motives from themselves not warranted from the word, turne out *Surplice*, *Crosse*, and all such stuffe out of the Church.

Mr. *Prynne*, Truth Triumphing, p. 128.

Master *Prynne*. *The Apostles speech*, 1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. *There are diversity of gifts, but the same spirit, there are diversity of operations, but the same God*, compared with *chap.* 8. to 13. and *c. 9. v.* 19. to 24. *I made my self a servant to all, that I might gain all, &c.* parallel'd with *Act.* 15. 1, 2, 5, 6, 10. to 32. and *chap.* 21. 18. to 30. *The Churches of Judea did retain the use of Circumcision, Purification, and other Iewish Rites, which the Gentiles by the Apostles resolution were not to observe*, and Act. 2. 22. *The Apostles frequented the Iewish Temple, and Synagogues (conforming themselves to the Order and Discipline thereof) and their own private Christian Assemblies; all this will clear, that all Churches had not one and the self same Church-Government.* *Ans.* If diversity of Gifts, as to be a speaker with Tongues, a Prophet, a Pastor, will prove the Discipline to be alterable at the Churches

Churches will, as are *Surplice, Crosse, &c.* I shall think men may infer any thing they please out of the Scripture; and that to be *Apostles, Pastors,* are as indifferent and variable as eating of meats, 1 *Cor.*8. and *Pauls* taking of wages at *Corinth,* 1 *Cor.*9. Which none can say; for if the Church should now command us to abstain from such and such meats, as the *Apostle* doth, 1 *Cor.*8. We should call that, and do call it, in the *Romish Church,* a *Doctrine of Devils,* 1 *Tim.* 4.1,2,3. All brought for this, from *Act.*15. *Act.*21. tendeth to this, the Lord himself for the then weakness of the Jews, of meer indulgence appointed some things to be indifferent, and abstained from, in the case of scandall: Therefore *Circumcision, Purification, Sacrifices of Bullocks, and sheep*; And all the Ceremonies of *Moses* his Law, may be commanded by the *Church,* so they have another signification then they had before, and shadow out *Christ* who is already come: But because *God* hath made some things indifferent, shall it follow that the *Pope,* yea, or any Church on earth can create an indifferency in things? they must then take from things their Morall goodnesse or conveniency with Gods Law, and take from them their moral badnes, & disconveniency to *Gods Law,* which to me is to change the nature of things, and to abrogate and change *Gods Laws*: it is true, *P. Martyr,* 1 *Cor.*9.19. saith, *Paul* was made all things to all men, *Quoad Ceremonias, & res medias,* in that he Circumcised *Timotheus*: The Law (saith he) was abrogated, *Verum id non adhuc Judæis liquebat;* The Jews were to be spared for a time, but only for a time, and therefore when the Gospel was sufficiently promulgated; *Paul* said, *Gal.*5. to be Circumcised was to lose *Christ,* and he refused to be a servant to *Peter* in his sinful Iudaizing, *Gal.*2. And *withstood him in the face*: Now, certain it is, *Peter* knew *Christ* was come in the flesh, and that his Iudaizing did not lay bands on his conscience, he preached the contrary, *Act.*11. And if *Peter* did Iudaize, as *Formalists* observe *Ceremonies,* and the *Galathians* were circumcised the same way (for they knew Circumcision had no Typicall Relation to *Christ* to come, they believed he was already come) then without cause, *Paul, Gal.*2. and 5. did rebuke, and argue either *Peter* or the *Galathians* of sinfull Iudaizing; which to say, were to speak against the Gospel. But certainly the Vniformity, and immutability of all these Ceremonies was, that then when the Gospel was sufficiently Proclaimed to all,

The indifferency of some things in the Apostolick Church, cannot infer that the Government is alterable.

to

to be under the Law of Ceremonies in any sort was damnable, and so is it now: And as the *Apostles* and *Church* then set up no Ceremonies, no *Surplice*, no *Crossing*, because they had no word of *Christ* to warrant them, neither can we do the like now; and they complyed for a time with the Iewish Ceremonies, being yet indifferent, but not but by warrant of the commandment and resolution of the *Apostles*, and the like are we obliged unto now, had we a Warrant of the like indifferency of Prelates, *Surplice*, *Crosse*, and that we were obliged to use them to gain the weak, in regard: 1. They were once obligatory Ordinances of God: 2. And if the day light of the Gospel were not yet sufficiently risen to shine upon those who are not wilfully ignorant, and had not yet acknowledged the Gospel to be Gods word, we should also be obliged to Ceremonies; yea, we durst not yield to any Law to lay them aside, as many *Formalists*, who hold them lawfull, have done.

Ibid. Mr. Prynne. *From the Creation till Moses, there was no one Universall set Form of Church-Government, to be observed in all the World: Nor one Form of Discipline under the Tabernacle, another under the Temple.*

Ans. All this concludeth not what is in question; its but the Popish Argument: This is to be concluded, that *Enoch*, *Seth*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *the Patriarchs and Moses* did set up a Church-Government of such timber as *Humane Prelates*, *Crosse*, *Surplice*, without any expresse Warrant from Gods mouth, and which they might alter by their own spirit; for this Argument is, *God might alter*; Ergo, *The Church now may alter Without a Warrant from God.* And shall we believe that the *Patriarchs* and *Moses* by their own spirit without any Commandment of God, might at their pleasure set up, and put down *Prophets*, *Circumcision*, *Tabernacle*, *Temple*, *Laws for Sacrifices*, *Priests*, *Levites*, *Arke*, *putting the Leaper in, or putting him out of the Campe*, *cutting any soul off from the Congregation of the Lord*, as our men will cry up, and down Ceremonies, and put on them the weight of a Talent, or a Feather, without any word of God? The Scripture cryeth the contrary so often, saying, *And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak thou unto the children of Israel*: Could Formalists say that, and *Christ spake unto the Prelats, and the Church, and said, Command the Pastor to crosse the Infant, and appoint unto your selves a Prelate over the Pastors*: I should gladly agree

gree to the mutable frame of humane Government.

Mr. Prynne. *There are but for the most part, generall rules prescribed to us for the very ordering and regulating of our thoughts, words, actions, lives, apparell, Children, servants, families, calling, &c. in the Word*; Ergo, *there be but generall rules for Discipline and Church-Government, which admit variety; the former do more immediately concern every man, the other more remotely.* Ib. p. 129.

Ans. If the *Word of God* do not more particularly regulate our thoughts, as, *Psal.* 10.4. *Psal.* 5.9. *Isa.* 55.7. *Ier.* 4.14. *Act.* 8.22. And our words and actions by which we must be judged, *Isa.* 3.8. *Ier.* 8.6. *Mal.* 3.13. *Ier.* 9.3. *Matth.* 12. 36,37. *Rev.* 22.12. *Rev.* 20.13. 2 *Cor.* 5.10. *Prov.* 5. 21. 1 *Sam.* 2,3. *Psal.* 119.9. *Prov.* 3. 23,24. Then the Scripture doth warrant *Surplice, and Crossing, and kneeling to Creatures, and humane Prelats*, which are changeable, and alterable circumstances and adjuncts of Worship, that may be, and may not be, and things indifferent; it shall follow, that for the most part, it is indifferent to do evil or well, sin or not sin, in thought, word and actions; and we have no warrant in Scripture for eschewing sin, or not eschewing it in the most of our actions. I confesse there is little need *to Walk, ἀκριβῶς accurately*, *Eph.* 5. 15. And *to cleanse our Wayes*, Psal. 119. 9. *according to the Word*; If words, thoughts and actions, may go at random, as if they were variable and indifferent Ceremonies, God throweth not men in hells torments, to be eternally miserable, for circumstances. 2. For the acts of our calling, if they be Morall, they are regulated as particularly by the word, as to believe, love and fear God, or the creature; if artificiall, they are not of our consideration. 3. That Morall acts of decent usage of the Ordinances, do not immediately concern men, is admirable to me. Mr. *Prynne*, Truth triuphing, p. 130,131, 132,133.

Mr. Prynne: *To the Argument of* Moses *his doing all according to the patern shown in the Mount, It is Answered: 1. The Tabernacle was no part of the Church of the Israelites; but only the place of meeting for Worship, answerable to our Churches and Chappels, and so was the Temple; But I pray you, God prescribed the height, length, bredth, form of Tabernacles, Ark, Altar, of every Pin, Ergo, Hath Christ as punctually prescribed to all Christians, and Nations, in expresse words, the form, matter, dimensions of all Christian Churches, Temples, Chappels, Tables, Challices, Pulpits, Pews, not varying in one* The Argument of *Moses* his doing all to the least pin, in the Tabernacle by speciall direction, considered.

pin,

pin. 2. *God named the men,* Bezaliel, *and* Aholiab, *who should make the Tabernacle and all the implements thereof.* 3. *God expressed the frame, fashion, colours, of the holy Garments of* Aaron *and his sons: shall it follow, Ergo, only the Artificers whom God nameth, immediately, and none but Embroyderers, Goldsmiths, Carpenters, &c. Not Pastors and Elders are to build up the Spirituall Churches of Christ, Ergo, The form, matter and colour of Ministers, and Elders garments are particularly set down in the New Testament.* 4. *The Tabernacle and Temple were corporall things made by mens hands, not Spirituall buildings of mens spirits.* 5. *All these of the patern were delivered to* Moses *the Temporall Magistrate, not to* Aaron *the Priest; Ergo, the Church under the Gospel is not a Spirituall building, whose maker and builder is God; and all is to be ordered by the Civill Magistrate, and Lay-Artificers, not by Pastors: I wonder also you alledge not* Noahs *Ark: And all in the New Testament, are not so particularly set down, as in the Old. Ans.* The Tabernacle was no part of the Church; but being a Type and the implements of it, to the least pin, particularly expressed by God to *Moses*; far more must we have from God an expresse for every Ceremony, not to retort this also, that a *Corner-Cap*, or a *Surplice*, is no part of the Church, and is indeed a teaching sign, and so should not be counted a Positive of Church-Policy. 2. Most false it is that the Tabernacle and Temple were nothing but a meeting place of the people for Worship, as our Churches or Chappels, are, 1. Because it is to Argue the Holy Ghost of want of wisdom, to spend so much Canonick Scripture in setting down things idely, not tending, at all to edification, and teaching us nothing of God, and in specifying the *Form, Height, Length, Bredth, Curtains, Candlesticks, Sockets, Rings*, of naturall places that contained their bodies; for what should it edifie us, if God should describe so particularly all the Churches and meeting places of the people under the New Testament? Now certain it is, *Whatsoever things were written afore time, were written for our Learning, Rom.* 15.4. 2. Many things in the *Tabernacle*, *as Candles in day light, Rings, Sockets, Shew-bread*, belonged nothing to a naturall place, as our *Chappels*, or *Meeting houses* do. 3. Expresly the Scripture maketh them more then places; to wit, Holy, Religious, and Typicall signes of Divine institution; as the *Tabernacle* was a Type, *Heb.* 8.2.5. *Heb.* 9. 1,2. *&c. Heb.* 10. 1,2,3. And the

Temple

Temple a Type of *Christs body*, *Ioh.* 2. 19. *Ioh.* 1. 14, 15. And all these were Types *and shadows of Heavenly things*, *Heb.* chap. 8, 9, 10. *Gal.* 4. 1. 2. *&c.* *Col.* 2. 16. 17. Which our *Churches* and *Chappels* are not, being only places common to sacred and Civill actions. 2. God therefore can no more in expresse words set down, the form, matter, dimensions of Christian Churches and Chappels, then of the Synagogues of the Iews which had no Morall use for edification and instruction. 3. Yea, because the *Tabernacle and Temple* and their implements, were teaching *shadows of good things to come*, and our Churches and Chappels are not so, nor have they any Morall or Religious use or influence on our spirits as the *Tabernacle and Temple* had; therefore the Lord, who is expresse in all Morals, which of their own nature do teach and edifie; he behoved to name *Bezaliel*, and *Aholiah*, and the form and colour of the Priests garments, which also are Typicall, and could not name our Elders, or the colour or form of their Garments. 4. All these weak retortions, suppose that the Tabernacle and Temple were types of our meeting houses for Worship, which is a meer conjecture; they were no more types of our Chappels, then of the Iewish Synagogues; we may not expound types at will, but as the *Holy Ghost* expoundeth them to us in the New Testament: And this is a conjecturall Exposition, and a dream to make *Bezaliel* and *Aholiah*, types of Embroyderers and Tradesmen.

5. We know the Tabernacle and Temple were corporall things made with hands, and that they are things different from the spirituall things that they signifie; as the sign and the thing signified; as therefore the Lord is expresse in the elements and Rites of the *Supper of the Lord*, because all of them, *Bread, Wine, taking, eating, breaking, pouring out the Wine, drinking*, are teaching and edifying signes; and our Lord never left it to the wisdom of men, to devise signes to teach themselves: so in like manner, should the Lord expresly specifie all the teaching and signifying signes in the Old Testament; and as *Moses* might devise none of his own, but was tyed to follow the patern, which the *Lord himself shewed to him in the Mount*: So are we now under the New Testament, tyed to the patern of that same will revealed in the Word; and it is laid on us, *Not to be wise above that which was written*; and it is of perpetuall equity: The supream Law-giver, never left it to the wisdom

of *Angels*, or *Men*, or *Prophet*, *Apostle* or *Church*, to serve and Worship God as they thought good: But he himself particularly prescribed the way, signes, and means: And because God hath not been pleased in the New Testament to specifie types of Christ incarnate, and come in the flesh already; therefore are we obliged in Conscience to believe, and practise no more, *either in Doctrinals, or teaching types, or Positives of Church-Policy*, then our *Patern in the Mount*, the Scripture hath warranted to us, to be the will of God, and in this and this only, standeth the force of the presenr Argument unanswered by paterns of unwritten Traditions, and not in these loose consequences, that we under the New Testament should have these types and Policy that the Church of the Iews had, which is the Doctrine of Papists and Formalists following them, not ours; for they prove their Pope and Prelat from the *Iewish High Priest*, their *Surplice*, from the linnen *Ephod* of *Jewish Priests*; their *Humane Holidayes*, from the *Iewish dayes*; their *kneeling to bread*, from their *bowing toward the Ark*. 6. It is not true, that the Tabernacle and Temple were meer corporall things, no more then bread and wine in their spirituall relation, are meer corporall things: The Lords end, use and intent, in the Tabernacle and Temple, was, that they should be to the people Images, *and shadows of heavenly and spirituall things*, *Heb.* 8. 5. *Heb.* 10. 1. 7. That all the things of the Tabernacle, were delivered to *Moses* as a *King*, and not as a *Prophet* and writer of Canonick Scripture, *Heb.* 3. 5. *Heb.* 8. *Luk.* 24. 44. 27. *Luk.* 16. 31. is an untruth, except *Formalists* make the *King* so the head of the Church, in prescribing Laws for the Policy thereof, as they make him a Canonick writer, as were *David*, *Moses*, *Solomon*, from whose example they would prove the King to be the head of the Church: But I judge *Moses* saw the *patern in the Mount*, *and God face to face*, as a Prophet whose words are Scripture to us, *Deut.* 34. 10. *And there arose not a Prophet since in Israel like unto* Moses, *whom the Lord knew face to face*; And as a *Prophet*, not as a *King*, his *face did shine*, Exod. 34. 27, 28, 29. And he was commanded *as a Prophet*, to write the Law, not as a King, *Numb.* 12. 6, 7. *Moses* is made the most eminent Prophet that was in the Old Testament. And why? Because God spake to other Prophets by Dreams and Visions: But he spake the Law and written Scripture to *Moses*, mouth to mouth: This

should

should not be a comparison between Prophet and Prophet, but between Prophet and King, by this learning. 8. We judge *Noahs* Ark doth prove the same, it being a speciall type of the *Church*, 1 Pet. 3. 20,21. And he *built it by Faith*, Heb. 11. 7. And so by *a Word of God*, and at Gods speciall direction, in all the length, bredth, formes of it, and not of his own head, *Gen.* 6. 14, 15, *&c.* And is commended by the spirit of God for so doing, *Gen.* 6. 22. *Thus did* Noah *according to all that God commanded him, so did he.* And *Formalists* should deserve the like Testimony, if it could be said of them, *And as the Lord commanded the Church, in creating* Prelats, Surplice, *and all the positives of Church-policy; so did she.* And so saith *Calvin*, on *Genesis.* 6. 22. And P. *Martyr*, and *Musculus* piously on this place: and with them, *Vatablus.* Hence I judge all other things in this, and the following Arguments Answer.

The Ark of *Noah* proveth the same.

Calvin, Com. in Gen. 6. 22. *Quare discamus per omnegenus impedimenta perrumpere, nec locum dare pravis cogitationibus quæ se Dei verbo opponunt, hunc enim honorem haberi sibi, flagitat Deus, ut eum finamus pronobis sepere.* P. Martyr. in loc. *Nihil negligit fides, omnia pro viribus exoquitur, quæcunque scit deum velle:* Musculus *Moses fidem & obedientiam Noah comprehendit, qua secundum verbum dei arcam construxit,* Vatablus *Hebraismus pro, quo fecit Noah prorsus, ut ei preceperat deus.*

SECT. IV.

ANy Positives not warranted by some speciall word of God shall be additions to the word of God: But these are expresly forbidden, *Deut.*4.2. *Deut.*12.32. *Prov.*30.6. *Rev.*22.18,19. To this Formalists answer: 1. *They have a generall Commandment of God, though not a speciall. Ans.* So have all the unwritten Traditions of Papists; *hear the Church*, she is *Magistra fidei*; so doth the Papist *Horantius* answer *Calvin, That the spirit of God hath given a generall and universall knowledge of mysteries of Faith and Ceremonies belonging to Religion, but many particulars are to be received by tradition from the Church: but of this hereafter.* 2. *Master Prynne* answereth that is a wresting, *These Texts* (saith he) *speak only of additions to books or doctrines of Canonical Scriptures then written, not of Church-Government or Ceremonies; yea, God him-*

Horantius in loc. Catholic. l. 2. c. 12. fo. 131. *Constat complura Dei spiritum post Christi ascensionem ecclesiam docuisse, quorum, etsi a Christo universalem quandam & in genere cognitionem habuissent fideles: non tamen in specie aut certè in numero, & singulariter unde universa fidei nostræ mysteria, & quæ ad religionem spectarent (intelligit Ceremonias Ecclesiæ) omnia literis conscripta esse non sine igno ratione affirmare potest (Calvinus.)*

self after the Writing of Deutronomy caused many Canonicall books of the old and New Testament to be Written: Many additions Were made to the service of God in the Temple not mentioned by Moses. Another answer *R. Hooker* giveth, teaching with Papists, *Bellarmine* (as in another place after I cite) with *Cajetane, Tannerus* and others; *That additions that corrupt the Word are here forbidden, not additions that expound and perfect the Word: True it is, concerning the Word of God, Whither it be by misconstruction of the sense, or by falcification of the Words, Wittingly to endeavor that any thing may seem Divine, Which is not, or any thing not seem, Which is, Were plainly to abuse even to falcifie divine evidence: To quote by-speeches in some Historicall narration, as if they Were Written in some exact form of Law, is to adde to the Law of God. We must condemn (if We condemn all adding) the Jews dividing the supper in two courses: their lifting up of hands unwashed to God in Prayer,* as Aristæus saith, *Their Fasting every Festivall day till the sixth hour. Though there be no expresse Word for every thing in speciality, yet there are general Commandments for all things; say the Puritans, observing general Rules, of* 1. *Not scandalizing:* 2. *Of decency:* 3. *Of edification:* 4. *Of doing all for Gods glory. The Prelate* Vsher, *in the question touching traditions; We speak not of Rites & Ceremonies, which are left to the disposition of the Church, and be not of Divine, but of Positive and Humane right: But that traditions should be obtruded for Articles of Religion, parts of Worship, or parcels of Gods word beside the Scriptures, and such Doctrines as are either in Scriptures expresly, or by good inference We have reason to gainsay.*

Mr. *Prynne*, Truth Triumphing p. 134.

Hooker, 3. book Eccle. pol. p. 93.

Usher in his Answer to the Iesuits challenge of Traditions pag. 35, 36.

Here is a good will, to make all Popish Traditions that are only beside, not contrary to Scripture (and in the Popish way all are only beside Scripture) as Lawfull, as our Ceremoniall additions, so they be not urged as *parts of Canonicall Scripture:* Well, the places *Deut.* 4. & 12. *Prov.* 30. *Rev.* 22. (say our Masters of mutable Policy) *forbid only Scripturall, or Canonicall additions, not Ceremonial additions:* But I wonder who took on them to adde additionals Scripturall: if *Baals Priests* should adde a worship of *Iehovah*, and not equall it with Scripture, nor obtrude it as a part of *Moses's Books*, by this means they should not violate this precept: *Thou shalt not adde to the Word, &c.* 2. *Additions explaining the Word*, or beside the Word, as Crossing the bread in the Lords-Supper are Lawfull, only *additions corrupting, or detracting from the Word*, and everting

Formalists acknowledge additions to the word of God, contracy to *Deut* 4. 2. & 12. 32. The same way that Papists do.

everting the sense of it, are here forbidden, and in effect these are detract ons from the word, and so no additions at all by this distinction are forbidden, but only detractions: The word for all this wil not be mocked, it saith, *Thou shalt not add, Thou shalt not diminish.*

But the truth is, a Nation of Papists answer this very thing for their Traditions. 1. Bishop Ans. to the 2. part of Refor. Catho. of Trad. §. 5. pag. 848. *The Words signifie no more, but that We must not either by addition, or substraction, change or pervert Gods Commandments, be they Written, or unWritten: Else Why Were the Books of the Old Testament Written afterwvard; if God had forbidden any more to be Written or taught, beside that one Book of* Deutronomy *? Shall We think that none of the Prophets that lived and Wrote many Volumns after this, had read these vvords, or understood them not, or did vvilfully transgresse them?* D. Abbot answereth, *What the Prophets vvrote, serve to explain the Law, they added no point of Doctrine to Moses Lavv,* for Exod. 24, 4. Moses *vvrote all the vvords of God,* Deut. 31. 9, 10. Moses *Wrote this Lavv, then he vvrote not a part of the Law, and left another part unvvritten.* The Iesuit *Tannerus* answereth the same *in terminis* with the Formalists: *Colloquio Ratisbonensi* foll. 11. & 13. D. Gretserus, *ad dicta, Resp. Prohiberi additionem quæ repugnet verbo scripto, non autem illam, quæ verbo scripto est consentanea cujusmodi sunt traditiones---Post pentateuchum accesserunt libri Josue, Prophetarum, &c. Tamen nemo reprehendit, quia illi libri fuerunt consentanei sacræ Scripturæ*: Additions contrary (say they) *to the vvord are forbidden, not such as agree vvith the vvord, such as are all the traditions of the Church; for after* Deutronomy *vvere vvritten the Books of* Ioshua *and the Prophets*; so Cajetan. Coment in Loc. *Prohibemur ne fingamus contineri in lege, quod in ea non continetur, nec subtrahamus, quod in ea continetur,* Gloss. Interline: *Non prohibet veritatem veritati addere, sed falsitatem omnino removet. Lira. Hic prohibetur additio depravans intellectum legis, non autem additio declarns aut elucidans*, Tostatus in Loc. Q. 2. *Ille* (pecat) *qui addit, addit tanquam aliquid de textu, vel necessarium, sicut alia quæ sunt in textu velut dictum a Spiritu sancto, & hoc vocatur proprie addere.* Formalists (as Dr. Morton say) *It is sin to adde to the vvord any thing, as a part of the Written vvord, as if Ceremonies Were a part of the vvritten Scripture, and Spoken by the immediate inspiring spirit that dyteth Canonick Scripture, they come only as*

Ar-

Arbitrary and ambulatory adjuncts of Worship from the ordinary spirit of the Church, and are not added as necessary parts of Scripture, or as Doctrinals; so Papists say, *their traditions are not additions to the Written vvord, nor necessary parts of the vvritten Scripture, but inferiour to the Scripture.* 1. They say their Traditions are no part of the written word or Scripture; for they divide the word of God in two parts, as *Bellarmine, Turrian, Tannerus, Stapleton, Becanus*, all of them say, *Aliud est verbum dei scriptum & dicitur Scriptura sacra, aliud est verbum dei non scriptum, & dicitur ecclesiæ traditio; There is one vvord of God vvritten, called the holy Scripture; And there is another vvord of God not vvritten, and it is called the Tradition of the Church.*

Now their Tradition is no more a part of the Scripture (but another part of the word of God contradistinguished from Scripture) then the body is a part of the soul, or *Scotland* a part of *England*, for both *England* and *Scotland* are collaterall parts of great *Brittain*; the Scripture (say they) is the unperfect rule of Faith, and not the compleat will of God, as touching Faith or manners, but Scripture and Tradition together, are the perfect and totall rule: so say Formalists, that Scripture is the compleat and perfect rule of Faith and manners to regulate all our Morall acts; But the other part of the distinction is, that Scripture is not a compleat and full rule to regulate all our Morall Acts whatsoever, whither of Faith or manners or Church-Policy, as it is no rule to my conscience and practise to believe, for orders, cause and obedience to my Superiours, and for decency that I am to wear a Religious significant linnen creature called a Surplice, or not to wear it, or that I am to excercise, or not exercise that grave action of *drawing my thumb Crosse the Air above the face of a Baptized Childe vvhile I baptize, to betoken his dedication to Christs service*: And hitherto neither Traditions, nor Positives of Church-Policy are added, as necessary parts of written Scripture: 2. Traditions are not added to the Scripture, by Papists, as coming from the immediatly inspiring spirit that dyted and wrote Scripture, more then our Ceremoniall Positives of policy: Its true, Papists say they come from an infallible spirit: But Formalists (I hope) refer not their unwritten Positives to so noble blood; yet in this, they agree that Traditions are not added by them, as descending from the immediate inspiring

ring ſpirit of written Scripture: Therefore Cornelius *a Lapide* ſaith, *Non addetis ad verbum quod vobis loquor, aliquid, ſcilicet tanquam meum, vel a me dictum aut juſſum, nulli enim homini licet preſcripta aut precepta ſua pro preceptis a deo (a ſpiritu ſancto immediatè inſpirante) dictatis, aut pro Scripturis ſacris addere; It is not lavvfull for any man to adde to the vvord any thing of his ovvn, as his ovvn, or as ſpoken and commanded by himſelf*: For no man may broach his own injunctions and precepts, as if they were the precepts taught by the immediate inſpiring ſpirit, ſpeaking in the Scriptures. Hence *Papiſts* teach that their Traditions flow from a little lower Spring, then from the immediately inſpiring Scripturall ſpirit; So I make this good from famous Ieſuites; *Cornelius a Lapide*, in *Deut.* 4. 1,2. ſaith, *Sed et ipſi judæi multa addiderunt legi, ut cœlaturas, omnemque ornatum templi; ut feſtum ſortium ſub Eeſter, feſtum datî ignis, feſtum Encæniorum &c. Hec enim non a deo, ſed a judæis ſancita et inſtituta ſunt, denique hec non ſunt addita, ſed potius incluſa legi dei: Quia Lex jubet obedire parentibus, Magiſtratibus, pontificibus eorumque legibus.* The *Jevvs* (ſaith he, objecting the inſtances of Formaliſts) *added many things to the Lavv, as the ingraving and adorning of the* Temple, *the feaſt of* Purim, *of Dedication &c. And theſe traditions vvere not ordained and inſtituted by God* (Ergo, *not by the immediate inſpiring ſpirit, as is the Holy Scripture*) *but by the* Iews, *and they were not added to the* Law, *but included in the* Law, *becauſe the* Law *biddeth obey Superiors and their* Laws; whence it is evident, that theſe very Ceremoniall traditions of Papiſts, for which Formaliſts contend, are not added to the word as coming from God, or the immediatly inſpiring ſpirit that diteth ſcripture; but from the Church, without warrant of Scripture, juſt as Popiſh traditions; which we count unlawfull additions to the word. And *Tannerus* the Ieſuit ſaith, Tom. 3. in 22. de fide, ſpe et cha. diſ. 1. de fide Q. 1. Dub. 8. *That the aſſiſtance of the ſpirit that the Church hath in propoſing unWritten traditions, requireth no poſitive inſpiration or ſpeech made by God to the Church; but it is enough that the Church have a very negative help of God only, by which ſhe is permitted not to erre*: His words are theſe: *Nam aſſiſtentia illa dei, quâ eccleſiæ adeſt, ne ejuſmodo rebus fidei* (in traditionibus non ſcriptis) *proponendis erret, per ſe non dicit, nec requirit poſitivam inſpirationem, ſeu, locutionem*

Divi-

Divinam ipsi ecclesiæ factam, sed contenta est quovis auxilio dei etiam mere negativo, quo fit ut ecclesia iys in rebuus non sinatur errare : Cum tamen nova revelatio utique novam inspirrtionem seu Locutionem dei aliquid positivè notificantem significet. And the like saith *Malderus*, in 22. de virtu. Theolog. That, *though traditions come from an infallible Spirit, no lesse then Scripture ; yet traditions are the Word of God, because they are heard and constantly believed : But the Holy Scripture is the Word of God, because written by the inspiration of the holy spirit.* Q. 2. Art. 1. Dub. 4. pag. 83. And therefore he maketh two sorts of traditions, *some meerly Divine, vvhich the Apostles received either immediately from the Holy Ghost, or from the mouth of* Christ, *as those touching the matter and form of the Sacraments : Others* (saith he) *are properly Apostolick, as those toucking the Lent Fast, instituted by the Apostles.* ib. tract. de trad. Q. Vnic. Dub. 1. *Traditiones* (inquit) *per apostolos traditæ, aliæ sunt Divinæ, quas immediatè ipsi a Spiritu sancto dictante, vel ex ore Christi acceperunt ; ut de materia et potissimum de formis sacramentorum ; aliæ autem propriæ dicuntur Apostolicæ, ut de Iejunio Quadragesimali, quod Apostoli Iustituerunt.* Hence it is evident, if Papists cannot but be condemned of impious additions to the Scriptures, by these places, *Deut.* 4. *Deut.* 12. Formalists are equally deep in the same crime : and the same is the answer of *Malderus*, ibid. Dub. 2. vetat. Apoc. 22. *Ne quis audeat Divinam prophetiam depravare, assuendo aliquid aut abradendo.* Turrianus, tom. de fide. spe. et cha. de traditio. disp. 20. Dub. 2. pag. 255. *Respondetur Joannem planè prohibere corruptionem Libri illius, non tamen prohibet ne alij Libri scribantur, vel alia Dogmata tradantur.* *Stapletonus*, Relect. Prin. fidei Doct. Contaver. 4. q. 1. Art. 3. *Sed non prohibet vel legis interpretationem per sacerdotes faciendam* (*imò hoc disertè prescribit*, Deut. 17.) *Vel aliquid aliud in fidem admittendum quod lege scriptâ non contineatur. Alioqui quicquid postea prophetæ predicaverunt, et Divinis Scripturis adjectum est, contra hoc dei mandatum factum censeri debet.*

Learned D. *Roynald* Answereth, Apolog. Thes. de sac. Script. pag. 211, 212. and saith : *This very Law of* Moses *promiseth life Eternall to those that love the Lord vvith all their heart, and, that the* Prophets *added to the Writings of* Moses, *no Article of Faith necessary to be believed ; but did expound and apply to the use of the Church*

Church, in all the parts of piety and Religion, that which Moſes *had* taught. *Lorinus*, followeth them in *Deut.* 4. 1. *Chriſtus* (inquit) *et Apoſtoli pentateucho, plura adjecerunt, immò in vetere* Teſtamento, Ioſue, Prophetæ, *Reges, Chriſt* (ſaith he) *and the Apoſtles added many things to the five Books of* Moſes; *yea, in the* Old Teſtament, Ioſhua, *the* Prophets *and the* Kings, David *and* Solomon, *did alſo adde to* Moſes. But the truth is, ſuppoſe any ſhould ariſe after *Moſes*, not called of God to be a Canonick writer, Prophet, or Apoſtle, and ſhould take on him to write Canonick Scripture, though his additions for matter were the ſame Orthodox and ſound Doctrine of Faith and manners, which are contained in the Law of *Moſes* and the Prophets; he ſhould violate this Commandment of God: *Thou ſhalt not adde.* For *Scripture* containeth more then the ſound matter of Faith; it containeth a *formall*, a heavenly form, ſtile, Majeſty and expreſſion of Language, which for the form, is *ſharper then a two edged ſword, piercing even to the dividing aſunder of ſoul and ſpirit, and of the joynts and marrow, and is a diſcerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart,* Heb. 4. 12. If therefore, the Prophets and Apoſtles had not had a Commandment of God to write Canonick Scripture, which may be proved from many places of the Word, they could not have added Canonick Scripture to the writings of *Moſes.* But the Anſwer of D. *Roynald*, is ſufficient and valid againſt Papiſts, who hold that their Traditions are beſide, not contrary to the Scripture; juſt as Formaliſts do, who ſay the ſame for their *unwritten Poſitives of Church-policy*: But our Divines Anſwer, *That traditions beſide the Scripture, are alſo traditions againſt the Scripture*, according to that, *Gal.* 1. 8. *But if we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel,* παρ' ὃ, *beſide that which we have preached unto you, Let him be accurſed*: And Papiſts more ingenious then Formaliſts in this, confeſſe, That, if that of the Apoſtles, *Gal.* 1. 8. be not reſtricted to the written Word, but applyed to the Word of God in its Latitude, as it comprehendeth both the written word or Scripture, and the unwritten word or Traditions; then beſide the word is all one with this, contrary to the word, which Formaliſts conſtantly deny. For *Lorinus* the Jeſuit ſaith, Comment. in *Deut.* 4. 2. *Quo pacto* Paulus Anathema *dicit*, Gal. 1. 8. *iis, qui aliud Evangelizant preter id quod ipſi Evangelizaverit, id eſt, adverſum et contrarium.* So doth *Cornelius a Lapide*:

pide, and *Estius* expound the place, *Gal.* 1. 8. And they say, that *Paul* doth denounce *a Curse against those that would bring in a new Religion and Judaism beside the Gospel:* But withall, they teach, that the Traditions of the Church are not contrary to Scripture, but beside Scripture; and that the Church which cannot erre, and is led in all truth, can no more be accused of adding to the Scripture, then the *Prophets, Apostles and Evangelists* who wrote after *Moses*, can be accused of adding to *Moses* his writings; because the *Prophets, Apostles* and *Evangelists*, had the same very warrant to write Canonick Scripture, that *Moses* had; and so the Church hath the same warrant to adde Traditions to that which the *Prophets, Evangelists* and *Apostles* did write, which they had to adde to *Moses*; And therefore the Councel of Trent saith, S. 4. c. 1. That, *unwritten traditions coming either from the mouth of Christ, or the ditement of the holy spirit, are to be recieved and Religiously Reverenced with the like pious affection and Reverence that the holy Scriptures are received, Pari pietatis affectu ac Reverentiâ*; And the truth is, laying down this ground, that the Scripture is unperfect, and not an adequat rule of Faith and manners, as Papists do; then it must be inconsequent, that because Traditions are beside the Scripture, which is to to them but the half of the Word of God; Yea, it followeth not, this Popish ground supposed, that Traditions are therefore contrary to the Scripture, because beside the Scripture, no more then it followeth that the Sacraments of the New Testament, *Baptisme*, and the *Supper* of the Lord, in all their positive Rites and Elements are not ordained and instituted in the Old Testament; and in that sense παρὰ, *beside the Old Testament*; that therefore they are *against the Old Testament*; though we should imagine they had been added in the New Testament, without all warrant of speciall direction from God, by the sole will of men; or because some Ceremonials commanded of God, are not commanded in the Morall Law or Decalogue, either expresly or by consequence; and so these Ceremonials, though instituted by the Lord, be beside the Morall Law; that therefore they are contrary to the Morall Law: Yea, to come nearer, because the third Chapter of the Book of *Genesis*, containing the Doctrine of mans fall and misery, and Redemption by the promised seed, is beside the first and second Chapters of the same Book, it doth not follow that it is contrary, or that *Moses* adding

adding the third Chapter, and all the rest of the five Books, did therefore fail against this precept, *Thou shalt not adde to that which I command thee*: for certain it is, that there are new Articles of Faith in the third *chapter of Genesis*, which are neither in the first two Chapters expresly, nor by just consequence; but if the Church or any other of *Jews* or *Gentiles* should take upon them to adde the third Chapter of *Genesis* to the first and second, except they had the same warrant of Divine inspiration that *Moses* had to adde it, that addition had been contrary to the first two Chapters, and beside also, and a violation of the Commandment of not adding to the word; so do *Formalists* and the *Prelate Vsher* in the place cited presuppose that the Scripture excludeth all *Traditions* of *Papists*, because the Scripture is *perfect in all things belonging to faith and manners*, but it excludeth not all Ceremonies, *which are left to the disposition of the Church, and be not of Divine, but of Positive and humane Right*: Hence it must infer the principle of *Papists*, that the Scripture is not perfect in all Morals, for it is a Morall of Decency and Religious signification, that a *childe be dedicated to the service of Christ by the sign of the crosse*. Now what can be said to this, I know not, but that the sufficiency, and perfection of scripture doth no whit consist in holding forth Ceremonials; but only in setting down doctrinals. Why? and Papists say the same, that the scripture is perfect, though it teach us not any thing of tradionals in speciall, yet in generall it doth hold forth the *traditions of the church*.

So *Tostat. Abulens.* in *Deut.* 4. v. 2. *ad lit.* saith, *Hic commendatur lex ex perfectione, quia perfecto, nec addi potest, nec auferri debet*: *Here the Law of God is commended* (saith he) *from its perfection, and that is perfect, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing should be taken*: Yea, so far forth is the scripture perfect, in the Articles of Faith, that *Castro in summa.* c. 8. *Canus locor. Theolog.* l. 2. c. 7. and l. 4. c. 4. and *Tannerus* tom. 3. in 22. disp. 1. de fide. Q. 1. dub. 7. saith, *We are not now to wait for any new revelation of any verity unknown to the Apostles, Et nihil novi definiri ab ecclesia Apostolis incognitum, and all verities now revealed were implicitely believed by the Apostles, and contained in Universall generall precepts, as that the Saints are to be worshipped, that Canonicall Books containeth the Word of God: the Bishops of Rome are the true successors of* Peter, *and Catholick pastors*, &c. and he saith, *Quod ecclesia non posset novum*

vum fidei articulum condere, communiter etiam docent Scholaſtici in 3.diſ.25.& he ſubſcribeth to that truth of *Vincentius Lyrinenſis*,c.17. *In eccleſia nulla nova Dogmata procudi, ſed pretioſam divini Dogmatis Gemmam exſculpi, fideliter cooptari, adornari ſapienter, ut intelligatur illuſtrius, quod antea obſcurius credebatur*: *No new points of faith, or manners are forged in the Church, but the precious pearl of divine truth is in it poliſhed, faithfully applied and wiſely illuſtrated, that they may be more clearly underſtood, which before was more obſcurely beleeved*; ſo that to ſay, the perfection of ſcripture conſiſteth not in particularizing all the ſmall poſitives of policy, is no more then Papiſts ſay of the perfection of the ſcripture in their traditions. 2. *Moſes* ſpeaketh both of the Morall and Ceremoniall Law, called by the names of חקים *Statutes rights*, and משפטים *Judgements* and Laws whatſoever extolled by *David*, Pſal.119. *As his delight, his joy, his heritage, his ſongs in the houſe of his pilgrimages*, and of both he ſaith, that there is life in keeping them: Now the *Ceremonies* of *Moſes* had an exceeding great excellency in looking to Chriſt, and being *ſhadows of good things to come*, Heb.10.1. And our Ceremonies have the ſame aſpect upon Chriſt: Why? but the day of the commemoration of *Chriſts Death, Nativity, Aſcenſion*; *Dedication to* Chriſt, *by a Croſſe in the Aire*, ſhould have the ſame influence and impreſſion on our hearts (if they be lawfull) that the like Ceremonies and Laws had upon *Davids ſpirit*, Chriſt being the object and ſoul of both? 2. Of theſe Ceremonies and Laws, *Moſes* ſaith, כי־הוא חכמתכם וביניתכם v.6. *For this is your wiſdom, and your underſtanding in the ſight of the Nations*: Why? but theſe ſame Ceremonies looking with a broader and fuller face on Chriſt already come (if Chriſt have put any life of lawfulneſſe in them) then their dim ſhadows of old, ſhould alſo be our wiſdom in the hearing of Pagans, who know not God? 3. It is a wonder to me that the learned Maſter *Prynne* ſhould ſay that the place, *Deut.4.* ſpeaketh nothing of *Church-Government* and *Ceremonies, but only of Doctrines of Canonicall Books*: For that is as much as to ſay the place ſpeaketh nothing of Divine Ceremonies, but only of divine Ceremonies, for what a number of Divine Ceremonies and Laws are in the Law of *Moſes*, which were given by the Lord himſelf? as is clear by the words, ver.1. *Now therefore hearken, O Iſrael, unto the Statutes and judgements that I teach you, that ye may live*, and v. 5. *Behold I have taught you Statutes and judgments, which the Lord*

my God commanded me, v. 8. *And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgements so Righteous, as* all this *Law which I set before you this day*? Now of all this Law the Lord saith, v. 2. *Ye shall not adde unto the Word which I commanded you, Neither shall ey diminish.* The Learned and Reverend Mr *Prynne*, must restrict this word of the Law, which can admit of no addition, to some speciall Law, either the Morall only, or the judiciall and Ceremoniall only, not to the former; for then additions to the Decalogue only, should be forbidden; this never man taught: *Stapleton*, indeed, Relect. Prin. fid. Doctrin, cont. 4. Q. 1. Art. 3. restricteth *it to the Ceremoniall Law only*; but *Moses* maketh it a Law as large, v. 2. *as the Word which God Commandeth*: And, *as* (saith he) v. 5. *the statutes and the judgements which the Lord Commanded me*, v. 8. *All this Law*, Deut. 31. 9. This written Law delivered to the Priests and kept in the Ark, *the Law that all Israel heard read*, v. 11. Of which it is said, v. 24. *When* Moses *had made an end of Writing of the Words of this Law in a Book, untill they were finished.* Now this was the whole *five Books of* Moses: And were there nothing of Church-Government in *Moses* Law? What shall we then say of the High Priest, his calling, Office, habit, of the Priests, Levites, their charge, calling, attire, of the Law of the Leaper, his healing; his extrusion out of the Camp, of the Law of those that were defiled with the dead, of their qualification who were to be *Circumcised*, who were to eat the Passeover, or who not, who were to enter into the house of God, and Congregation, who not; not a few of these, touching Church-Government, are included in the Law that God Commanded Israel, as their wisdom. 4. That *there were many additions* made to the service of God in the Temple, not mentioned by *Moses*, is nothing to purpose, except it be proved that these additions were made by the Church, without any word of God, the contrary whereof is evident, for the Temple and whole patern thereof, was delivered in writing by the Lord to *David*, 1 *Chron.* 28. 11. 19. If Formalists will have no Laws made but by *Moses*, as the only Law-giver, they have as good reason to say, That *Moses* was the only Canonick writer, and none but he, which is absurd. Or, 2. That *Moses* by his own spirit was a Law-giver, and had active influence in excogitating the Law; We conceive that Protestants are to own this Doctrine, which *Tostatus* imputes to us as *Hereticks*, Com. in Loc.

Moses and Canonick writers, are not Law-givers under God, but organs of God in writing, & meer reporters of the Law of God.

Loc. Q. 2. *Quasi* Moses *nudus minister & relator verborum (dei) esset, & non legem conderet:* As *if* Moses *were a meer servant, and a naked reporter of the Lords Law and Words, and not a Law-maker.* For in the making of Laws and Divine institutions, we judge that all the Canonick writers were meer patients, as the people are; for God is the Commander, and *Moses* the person Commanded, and a meer servant, *Deut.* 4.5. *Mal.* 4.4. *Heb.* 3.3,4,5. And *Moses* and all Canonick writers were only to receive the word at Gods mouth, and to hear it, *Ezek.* 3.8. As meer servants; and in this the *Church* of *Prophets* and of *Apostles*, and the Church that now is, were alike: I know no Authority of the one above the other. Indeed, in writing and relating to the Church, the will of God, and the Scriptures; Canonick writers are agents inspired with the Holy spirit, immediately breathing on them in Prophecying and in writing Scripture. But the Proclaimer of a Law, as such hath no influence in making the Law: Let it be also remembred, that as Papists say two things to the place, so do Formalists. 1. That it is not against Ceremonies. 2. That the Church is limited in making Ceremonies beside the Word, that they may not make them too numerous and burdensome: This I make good in the words of a famous Iesuit, who citeth the words of a Learned Papist, approving them.

Papists say, that the Chrch is limited in making Ceremonies, both in matter and number, and so do Formalists.

Lorinus, Coment. in Loc. *Refellit idem Oleaster Hereticos hinc inferentes institui, non, posse Ceremonias ac ritus novos circa cultum dei: Quam vis ipse optat moderationem in preceptis ac censuris, ut facilius & suavius possint servari:* To whom I oppose that golden sentence of a man, endued with the spirit of God above any Papist: *Calvin.* Com. in *Deut.* 4. v. 2. *Insignis locus, quo apertè damnatur quicquid hominum ingenio excogitari potest.* Ibid. *Quoniam prepostera lascivia rapitur totus ferè mundus ad cultus fictitios, qui tamen precise une verbo damnantur, ubi deus ita jubet suos acquiescere posita legi, ne justiores esse appetant, quam illic docentur. All Worship is precisely condemned here, or any thing devised about the Worship by the Wit of men.* I would here meet with a Grand exception of Mr. *Hooker*, Eccles. Polic. 3. Book, pag. 111. *Their distinction of matters of substance, and of circumstance, though true, will not serve; for be they great things, or be they small, if God have Commanded them in the Gospel, and (if) his Commanding them in the Gospel do make them*

them unchangeable, there is no reason that We should change the one more then the other; if the authority of the maker do prove their unchangeablenesse which God hath made, then must all Laws which he hath made, be necessarily for ever permanent, though they be but of circumstances only, and not of Substance.

Ans. 1. Our distinction of matters of substance and circumstance rightly taken, will serve the turn: But the mistake is, in that 1. Many things are but circumstances of worship, such as are Positives and Religious significant Ceremonies to *Formalists*, that are not so to us, for to wear a surplice in sacrificing to *Jupiter*, were to make the Act of wearing that Religious habit, an act of Religious honouring of *Jupiter*, but to wear Surplice and to sacrifice in that habit to *Jupiter* at eight of clock in the morning, rather then at ten, in this place Physicall, rather then this, is no worshipping of *Jupiter*, but a meer Physicall circumstance, neither up, nor down to the worship, and time and place Physicall, are neither worship, nor Religious means of worship: 2. Time, and Place, Name, Country, Form, Figure, Habit or Garments, to hold off injuries of Sun and Heaven as such are never commanded, never forbidden of God, and therefore the change of these circumstances can be no change of a Commandment of God: We never advanced circumstances, as such to the orbe and spheare of Morals; *Formalists* do so advance their Ceremonies, and therefore if God command *Surplice*, though by the intervening authority of his Church, such cannot be altered, except God command to alter the Religious signification of white linnen, but we know not where God hath commanded the alteration of any Ceremonies, except that, the Lords coming in the flesh, as a thing to come, must alter all Ceremonies which shadow forth Christ to come, when the body Christ is come already: Let us know such a ground for alteration of corner Cap, Altar, Surplice, except to drive such Oxen out of the Temple. 3. We hold that the Lords commanding such a thing in the Gospel, is a reason why it should be necessarily permanent for ever, except the Lord hath commanded it should be for a time only, as he commanded *Moses's Ceremonies*, and so *Gods* Authority of commanding a thing to be unchangeably in his worship, is a reason why it should be unchangeably in his worship; and his commanding any thing to be for a time only, and alterably in his worship, is a reason why it should be for a time

time only, & alterably in his worship; so to us Gods Commandment is a reason, why his own Ceremonies and Sacraments of the *New Testament* should be in the Church, because the Law-giver hath in scripture commanded them to be: and the reason why *Hookers* surplice and crossing should not be, is because he hath commanded no such thing: Now the reasons of alteration of any Laws in the Gospel, is from God, never from the *Church*: as 1. If God immediately inspire *Moses* to make a tabernacle, and thereafter inspire *David* and *Solomon* to make the Temple in the place of the tabernacle, and give them no Commandment for a tabernacle, its evident that God hath altered and removed the Tabernacle, and that the alteration is not from *David* nor *Solomon*: 2. If God command types and Ceremonies to be in his Church, till the body Christ come, *Col.* 2. 17. then when Christ is come, and his coming sufficiently published to the world, then are his own Ceremonies altered, and removed; but not by the discretion of *Peter* and *Paul*, or the Church, but by God himself. 3. When God commandeth such Offices to be in his house, which dependeth immediately upon his own immediate will of giving gifts essentially required to these Offices, then these offices are so long in his Church, as God is pleased by his immediate will to give these gifts; and when God denyeth these gifts essentially requisite, sure it is, his immediate wil hath altered and removed the office, not the will of the Church, so the Lord hath alterd and removed these Offices and gifts of Apostles, who could *speak with tongues*, and seal their doctrine with *Miracles*, *Evangelists*, *Prophets extraordinarily inspired*, *gifts of healing*, &c. 4. Some things are not matters of worship at all, but of goods, as the community of goods, love-Feasts, matters of civill conversation, these are only in their morality, as touching distribution to the necessities of the Saints, and brotherly kindenesse, unalterable, and no otherwise.

Four wayes positives are alterable by God only.

All things though never so smal, are a like unalterable, if they be stamped with Gods authority, speaking in the Scripture.

Now for these things that are smaller or weightier, we hold they are not in their weightinesse or smallnesse of importance to be considered, but as the Authority of God hath imprinted a necessity on them, so are they obligatory to us: I am obliged to receive this as scripture, that *Paul left his cloak at Troas*; no lesse then this, *Christ came into the world to save sinners*, in regard of Canonicall authority stamped upon both: *R. Hooker* with other *Formalists*, *Will have*

the

the lightnesse of matter to make the Law alterable: Truly to eat of the Tree of knowledge of good and ill, being put in the ballance with the love of God in it self, is but a light thing; yet the breach of that Law involved all the world in condemnation.

And what else is this, but that which Papists say, that there be two sort of things in scripture? so saith *Cornelius a Lapide* Comem. on 2 Tim. 3. 16. 1. *The Law and the Prophets, these God revealed and dyted to Moses and the Prophets; but there are other things in Scripture, as Histories and morall exhortations, which Canonick writers learned either by hearing, seeing, reading or meditation, there was no need these should be dyted, by the inspiration of the holy Spirit, for they know them themselves, though they were assisted. 2. Excited by the holy spirit to write; Conceptum, & memoriam eorum quæ sciebant, non iis suggessit spiritus sanctus sed inspiravit ut hunc potius conceptum, quam illum scriberent, & omnes eorum sententias & conceptus ordinavit, digessit, & direxit spiritus sanctus*, v.g. *Vt hanc sententiam primo, illam secundo, aliam tertio collocarent*: Yet *Estius* saith on the place; *The Scriptures are given by divine inspiration, ita ut non solum sententiæ, sed & verba singula & verborum ordo, ac tota dispositio sit a deo, tanquam per seipsum loquente ac scribente*: *So as not only the sentences, but every word, and the order and disposition of words is of, or from God, as if he were speaking and writing himself.*

Now for the additions Canonicall, that the *Prophets* and *Apostles* made to the writing of *Moses*: I hope *Papists* and *Formalists* cannot with any forehead alledge them, to prove that the Church may adde Traditions, and alterable Positives of *Church-Policy* to the written word of God, except upon the same ground, they conclude, That the Church now hath the same immediatly inspired spirit, that the *Prophets* and *Apostles* had, and that our *Prelats* saw the visions of God, when they saw but the *visiones aulæ*; *the visions of Court*, and that their calling was, as *Pauls was*, Gal. 1. 1. *not of men, neither by men, but by Iesus Christ*: When as it is not by Divine right, and was both of the King, and by Court: 2. Except they infer that the Church that now is, may adde Canonicall and Scripturall additions to the Scripture; for such additions the Prophets and Apostles added to the writings of *Moses*: and 3. that that precept, *Thou shalt not adde, &c.* was given to the Lord himself to binde up his hands, that no Canonick Scripture should ever be,

By what authority Canonicall additions of the Prophets and Apostles were added to the Books of Moses.

but the only writings of *Moses*, which is (as some write) the dream of *Süduces*, whereas inhibition is given to the Church of God, not to God himself, for what the *Prophets* and *Apostles* added, God himself added; yea, to me it is a doub. (w.l. I be better informed) if the Lord did ever give any power of adding to his Scripture at all, without his own immediate inspiration, to either *Prophet* or *Apostle*; or that God did never command *Moses*, or *Prophet* or *Apostle* to write Canonick Scripture of their own head, or that his Commandment to write Scripture, was any other then an immediate inspiration, which essentially did include every syllable and word that the *Apostles* and *Prophets* were to write: For I do not conceive, that if God gave to *Apostles* and *Prophets* power to devise a Gospel and write it: I suppose Angels or men could not have devised it; yea, that they could no more have devised the very Law of nature, then they could create such a piece, as a reasonable soul, which to me is a rare and curious book, on which essentially is written by the immediate finger of God, that naturall Theology, that we had in our first creation. 2. I do not conceive, that as Princes and Nobles do give the Contents, or rude thoughts of a curious Epistle to a Forraign Prince, to their Secretary, and go to bed and sleep, and leaves it to the wit and eloquence of the Secretary, to put it in forme and stile, and then signes it, and seals it without any more ado; so the Lord gave the rude draughts of Law and Gospel, and all the pins of *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, Church-officers, and Government, and left it to the wit and eloquence of Shepherds, Heardsmen, Fishers, such as were the Prophets, *Moses*, *David*, *Amos*; and *Peter* and divers of the *Apostles*, who were unlettered men, to write words and stile as they pleased, but that in writing every jot, tittle, or word of Scripture, they were immediatly inspired, as touching the matter, words, phrases, expression, order, method, majesty, stile and all: So I think they were but Organs, the mouth, pen and *Amanuenses*; God as it were, immediately dyting, and leading their hand at the pen, *Deut* 4.5. *Deut*.31.24,25,26. *Mal*.4.4. 2 *Pet*.1.19.20,21. 2 *Tim*.3.16. *Gal*.1.11,12. 1 *Cor*.11.23. so *Luk*. 1.70. God borrowed the mouth of the Prophets; *As he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which hath been since the world began:* Now when we ask from Prelates what sort of additionall, or accidentall worship, touching Surplice, Crosse, and other Religious Positives

Canonick writers how immediatly led by God.

fitives of Church-Policy, it is; that they are warranted to adde to the word, and how they are distinguished from Scriptures, Doctrinals: They give us these Characters of it, 1. God is the Author of Doctrinals, and hath expressed them fully in scripture: But the Church is the Author of their Accidentals; and this is essentiall to it, that it is not specified particularly in scripture, as *Bread* and *Wine*, *Taking and Eating in the Lords Supper* is; for then it should be a Doctrinall point, and not Accidentall. 2. It is not in the particular a point of faith and manners, as Doctrinals are: But hear the very Language of Papists; for Papists putteth this essentiall Character on their Tradition, that it is not written, but by word of mouth derived from the *Apostles*, and so distinguished from the written word; for if it were written in scripture, it should not be a Tradition.

The Characters of Formalists, Ceremonies, & Papists Traditions one and the same.

So the Jesuit *Malderus*, in 22. tom. de virtut. de obj. fidei Q. 1. Dub. 3. *Pro Apostolica traditione habendum est, quod cum non inveneatur in Divinis literis, tamen Universa tenet ecclesia, nec consiliis institutum, sed semper retentum* 2. That the Traditions are necessary, and how far Papists do clear, as I have before said; for the Church may coin no Articles of faith, these are all in Scripture. For the Iews *two Suppers*, and their additions to the passeover, as *Hooker* saith, and *their fasting till the sixth hour every Feast day*, we reject as dreams, because they are not warranted by any word of institution; not to adde, that the *Church of the Jews* never took on them to command the observation of these forgeries, under the pain of Church-censures, as Papists and prelats did their *Crossing* and their *Surplice*.

Hooker saith, *A Question it is, whither containing in Scripture, do import expresse setting down in plain terms, or else comprehending in such sort, that by reason, we may thence conclude all things which are necessary to salvation. The Faith of the Trinity, the Co-eternity of the Son With the Father, are not the former way in Scripture; for the other, let us not think, that as long as the World doth indure, the wit of man shall be able to sound to the bottom of that which may be concluded out of Scripture.----Traditions we do not reject, because they are not in Scripture; but because they are neither in Scripture, nor can otherwise sufficiently, by any reason, be proved to be of God. That which is of God, and may be evidently proved to be so, we deny not; but it* 1 Book, eccles. Pol. p. 42. Pag. 44.

hath in its kinde, although unwritten, yet the self same force and authority with the Written Laws of God. --- Such as are alterable Rites and Customes, for being Apostolical, it is not the manner of delivering them to the Church; but the Author from whom they proceed, which gave them their force and credit.

What is it to be contained in Scripture, and how far it maketh any thing unlawfull according to *Hooker*.

Ans. 1. The consequences of Scriptures are doublesse many, and more then are known to us, and the particulars of that Government that we contend for, are in Scripture, that is, there should be no Government, but what is either expressly in Scripture, or may be made out, by just consequence, we believe, if they cannot be proved from Scripture, let them fall as mens *hay and stubble*. But in the meantime, these are two different questions: *Whither there be an immutable Platform of Discipline in the Word? Or whither ours be the only Platform and no other?* If we carry the first, Ceremonies must fall. And certainly, in all reason, we are on the surest side: If we cannot observe all that is written, it is not like that God hath laid upon us unwritten burdens. 2. *Hooker* doth not reject all the Popish Traditions, as our Divines Reformed do; because they are not warranted by the Word; so, that if the *Images of God and Christ, and the Worshipping of them, and Purgatory, and the Supremacy of the Pope*, can be proved to be of God, though they be no more in Scripture, then *Crossing and Surplice*; then would he receive all these, as *Having the self same force and authority with the Written Laws*. Now we know no other weightier Argument to prove there's no Purgatory, but because the scripture speaketh of Heaven and Hell, and is silent of Purgatory. 2. That naturall reason can warrant a positive instituted Worship, such as *Surplice*, *betokening Pastorall Holinesse*, without any Scripture, is a great untruth; for naturall reason may warrant new *Sacraments*, as well as new *Sacramentals*. 3. If Traditions have their force and credit from God, not from the manner of delivering them, that is, from being contained in scripture, or not contained in it; then certainly they must be of the same Divine necessity with scripture: For whither Christ Command that the *Bæreans* believe in the Messiah, by the Vocall Preaching of *Paul*, or by the written scriptures of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, it is all one, it is the same word, and coming from Christ, must be of the same Divine authority: But this is to beg the question, for that we are to believe no unwritten tradition;

because

because it is unwritten, to *have the self same force and authority with the Written Laws of God.* For *Lorinus, Cornelius a Lapide,* Com. in 4. Deuter. *Estius,* Com. in. 2. Thes. 2.15. *Bellarmine, Tannerus, Malderus, Becanus,* say, *Whither the Lord deliver his minde to us in his Written Scripture, or by Tradition, it is still the Word of God, and hath authority from God.* But the truth is, to us it is not the Word of God, if it be not a part of the Counsel of God written in *Moses,* or the *Prophets and Apostles*; for though the Word have authority only from God, not from the Church, nor from men, or the manner of delivering of it, by word or writ; yet we with the Fathers and Protestant Divines, and evidence of scripture, stand to that of *Basilius,* Homil. 29. Advers. calumniantes. S. Trinit. Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτει; *Believe what are written, vvhat are not vvritten seek not after*: And so, seek not after Surplice, Crossing, and the like: And that ὅτι δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα, ἡ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς εἰς πληροφορίαν μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐντρωπὴν δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν; *Every word* (and so this, *That Crossing Surplice, are Religious signes of spirituall duties*) *and every thing or action, must be made good by the Testimony of the heavenly inspired Scripture; these things that are good* (and so Religiously decent and significant) *may be fully confirmed, and these that are evil, confounded:* And to us, for our Faith and practise, if it be not Law and Testimony, it is darknesse, and not light. And as *Gregor. Nyssen.* the Brother of *Basyl* saith, Dialog. de anim. et Resurrect. tom. 2. ed. Grecolat. pag. 639 Edit. Grec. pag. 325. *That only must be acknowledged for truth, in which is the* σφραγὶς, *the seal of the Scriptures Testimony,* Μὴ οὐχὶ ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τιθέσθω, ᾧ φραγὶς ἐπέστι τῆς γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας. *And how shall it be true to us if Scripture say it not? Or how shall it appear to us to be from God?* For *Cyril Alexandrin.* saith, *What the holy Scripture saith not* (such as are your Positives of mens devising) *how shall we receive it, and account it, amongst things that are true?* And it is not that which Hereticks of old said, for their Heresies to say (as *Hooker* doth) that any thing may be proved to be of God, which is not written in Scripture: For saith *Hieronimus,* in Hag. c. 1. *Sed & alia quæ absque authoritate & testimoniis Scripturarum, quasi Traditione Apostolicâ sponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit Gladius dei.* The Scripture doth bar the door upon Hereticks, saith *Chrysostome,*

The Fathers teach that all things in Worship, are to be rejected that are not in scripture.

Basil. in Ethicis, Reg 26.

Cyril Alex. Glaphyro in Gent. l. 2. ὁ γὰρ οὐκ εἰρηκεν ἐν θείᾳ γραφῇ, τίνα δὲ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιοῦμεθα.

Chrys. hom. 10. in Ioan. 59. καθάπερ γὰρ τίς θυρα ἀσφαλὴς οὕτως ἀποκλεί ει τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς τὴν συνοδον.

stome,--- And he is a Theef that taketh another unlawfull way then the Scripture. And by what Argument can reason without Scripture prove that *Crosse and Suplice* are of God: But by that same reason, Papists without Scripture, can, and may prove their Traditions to be of God? And if we admit reason, and exclude Scripture, it is as easie to prove their Traditions, as our Positive additions to Worship: And what Answers Papists give for their Traditions, to elude the power of Scripture, and evidence of Testimonies of fathers, all these same are given by Prelats for their additions; to say nothing that *Hooker* asserteth unwritten Traditions to be *Gods Word*; and in the very stile of the Councel of *Trent*, we are to acknowledge *Traditions, though unwritten, yet to have the self same authority and force with the Written Laws of God.* And shal the Surplice and Crosse and such stuffe, be *of the self same force and authority* with the Evangel according to *Luke and John*: But what wonder? For *Hooker* holdeth, that we have no other way to know the scripture to be the Word of God, but by Tradition, which Popish Assertion holden by him and *Chillingworth*, to me, is to make the Traditions of men the object of our Faith.

Concilen. Tridenti. c. 1. Sess. 4. Synodus traditiones sine scripto, atque scripturam paripietatis affectu, ac reverentia suscipit ac veneratur. Ibib. p. 46.

Hooker: *About things easie and manifest to all men by Common sense, there needeth no higher Consultation, because a man whose wisdom is for weighty affairs admired, would take it in some disdain to have his Counsel solemnly asked about a toy; so the meannesse of some things is such, that to search the Scriptures of God for the ordering of them, were to derogate from the Reverend Authority of the Scripture, no lesse then they do, by whom Scriptures are in ordinary talking very idely applied unto vain and Childish trifles.*

It derogateth nothing from the honour of God in Scripture. that he be consulted in the meanest things.

Ans. 1. It is a vain comparison to resemble God to an earthly wise man in this; for a *King of Kings*, such as *Artaxerxes*, if he were building a stately Palace for his Honour and Magnificence, would commit the drawing of it, the frame, the small pins, rings, bowles, to the wisdom of a Master of work, skilled in the Mathematicks, and not trouble his own Princely head with every small pin; but this is because he is a man, and cometh short of the wisdom, skill, and learning of his servants. 2. Because, how his Honour and Magnificence be declared in every small pin of that Palace, is a businesse that taketh not much up the thoughts of a stately Prince. The contrary of both these are true in the *Lord our God*, his wisdom is

is above the wisdom of *Moses*, and *Moses* cannot frame a Tabernacle or a Temple for Gods Honour in the least pin or snuffer, with such wisdom as the only wise God can do. 2. The Lord is more jealous and tender of his own Honour, in the meanes and smallest way of Illustrating of it: Yea, in the smallest Pin, then earthly Princes are; for earthly Princes may Communicate with their inferiours the glory of curious works set forth, as speaking monuments of their honour; the Lord *Who will not give his glory to another*; never did communicate the glory of devising worship, or the Religious means of worshipping and honouring his glorious Majesty to men. 2. God hath thus far condiscended in his wisdom, to speak particularly in written Oracles of every Pin, Ring, tittle, Officer of his house, of every Signe, Sacrament, Sacramentall never so mean and small; *Ergo*, It is no derogation from the dignity of Scripture, to have a mouth to aske counsell, where God hath opened his mouth to give Counsell in written Oracles: 3. There is nothing positive in Gods worship so small, as that we may dare to take on us to devise it of our own head. 4. *Hooker* contradicteth himself; he said the Ceremonies have their authority from God, and though unwritten have the self same force and authority with the written Laws of God, *pag.*44. Here he will have the unwritten positives so small and far inferiour to written Scripture, that to aske for Scripture to warrant such small toys, *is to derogate* from the reverend Authority and Dignity of the Scripture: so Ceremonies *pag.*46. are but *Toyes, unworthy to be Written With Scripture*, but p.44. *They have the self same force and authority with written Scripture.*

Hooker. *It is unpossible to be proved, that only the Schoole of Christ in his Word is able to resolve us, what is good and evil: for What if it were true concerning things indifferent, that unlesse the Word of the Lord had determined of the free use of them, there could have been no Lawfull use of them at all, which notwithstanding is untrue; because it is not the Scriptures setting down things indifferent, but their not setting them down as necessary, that doth make them to be indifferent.* Hooker l. 2. p.60.

Ans. Then becaufe the scripture hath not forbidden the killing of our children to God, as a false worship against the second Commandment, but only as an act of Homicide against the sixth Commandment, and hath not forbidden all the *Jewish Ceremonies*, so they have

How things are in Scripture.

have a new signification to point forth Christ already come in the flesh, these must all be indifferent: For let Formalists give me a Scripture to prove, that *Circumcision, killing of Children, sacrificing of Beasts*, are any wayes forbidden in this notion, but in that they are not commanded, or *set down in the word as not necessary*? 2. Such Divinity I have not read; *That only the Schoole of Christ is not able to resolve us what is good and evil:* I mean Morally good and evil. For *Hooker* pag. 54 Book 2. saith, *The controversie would end, in which we contend, that all our actions are ruled by the word: If* 1. *we would keep our selves within the compasse of morall actions, actions which have in them vice or vertue:* 2. *If we would not exact at their hands for every action, the knowledge of some place of Scripture, out of which we must stand bound to deduce it.* Then it is like the School of Christ, the word can and doth teach us, what is *a Morall action good or ill, an action in which there is vertue or vice*; and to me it is a wonder, that the Old and New Testament, which containeth an exact systeme and body of all Morals, whither naturall or Civill, or supernaturall, should not be the only rule of all Morals.

Pag. 56. Now I finde that Mr. *Hooker* saith two things to this; 1. *That Scripture doth regulate all our Morall actions, but not scripture only, for the Law of nature, and the most concealed instincts of nature, and other principles may warrant our actions: We move,* (saith he) *we sleep, we take the Cup at the hand of our friend; a number of things we often do, only to satisfie some naturall desire, without present expresse and actuall reference to any Commandment of God; unto his glory, even these things are done which we naturally perform, and not only that which naturally and spiritually we do, for by every effect proceeding from the most concealed instincts of nature, his power is made manifest. But it doth not therefore follow, that of necessity we shall sin, unlesse we expresly intend the glory of God, in every such particular.*

Some actions supernaturally morall, some morall naturally or civilly, others are mixt.

Ans. I speak of these more distinctly hereafter, here I answer, that as there be some actions in man purely and spiritually, but supernaturally morall, as to *believe in Christ for Remission of sins, to love God in Christ*: These the Gospel doth regulate. 2. There be some actions naturally morall in the substance of the act, as many things commanded, and forbidden in the Morall Law; and these are to be regulated by the Law of nature and the Morall Law: 3. There be some

some actions mixed, as such actions in which nature, or concealed instincts of nature are the chief principles, yet in, and about these actions, as in their modification of time, place, and manner, and measure, there is a speciall morality, in regard of which they are to be ruled by the word, such mixed actions as these, that are mentioned by *Hooker*, *As to move, sleep, take the cup at the hand of a friend*, cannot be called simply morall, for to move may be purely naturall, as if a man against his will fall off a high place, or off a horse, to start in the sleep are so naturall, that I know not any morality in them; but sure I am, for *Nathaniel* to come to Christ, which was also done by a naturall motion, is not a meer naturall action, *proceeding from the most concealed instincts of nature*; so to sleep hath somewhat naturall in it, for beasts do sleep, beasts do move; I grant they cannot take a cup at the hand of a friend, they cannot salute one another: (It is *Hookers* instance) but fancy sometimes in men do these, whereas conscience should do them: What is naturall in moving and sleeping, and what is common to men with beasts, I grant, Scripture doth not direct or regulate these acts of moving and sleeping; we grant actions naturall and common to us, with beasts, need not the rule of the Word to regulate them: But this I must say (I speak it, my Record is in Heaven, not to offend any) *Formalists*, as such, and as Prelaticall, are irreligious and Profane: One of them asked a godly man, *Will you have Scripture for giving your horse a peck of Oats, and for breaking winde, and easing or obeying nature?* And therefore they bring in these instances to make sport: But I conceive, sleeping moderately, to inable you to the service of God, as eating, drinking, that God may be glorified, 1 *Cor.* 10.31. are also in the measure, & manner of doing, Morall, & so ruled by Scripture, and Scripture only, and not regulated by naturall instincts: But what is all this to the purpose? are *Surplice*, *Crossing*, *Saints-dayes*, such actions as are common to us with beasts, as moving and sleeping are? Or is there no more need that the Prelate be regulated in wearing his *corner-Cap*, his *Surplice in Crossing*, then a beast is to be ruled by Scripture in moving, in sleeping, in eating grasse?

Some habituall reference to Scripture is required in all our Morall actions.

2. Expresse and actuall reference and intention to every Commandment of God, or to Gods glory in every particular action; I do not urge, a habituall reference and intention I conceive is holden

den forth to us in Scripture: 1 *Cor.*10.31. 3. *God by every effect, proceeding from the most concealed instinct of nature is made manifest in his power.* What then? the power of God is manifest in the Swallows building her nest; *Ergo*, neither the Swallow in building her nest, nor the *Prelate in Crossing an Infant in Baptisme to dedicate him to Christ*, have need of any expresse or actuall reference to any Commandment of God or Gods glory: Truly, it is a vain consequence in the latter part, except *Hooker* make *Surplice, Crossing*, and all the mutable Frame of *Church-Government* to proceed *from the most concealed instincts of nature*, which shall be new Divinity to both *Protestants* and *Papists*: And I pray you, what power of God is manifest in a *Surplice*? I conceive it is a strong Argument against this mutable frame of Government, that it is not in the power of men to devise, what Positive signes they please, without the word to manifest the power, wisdom and other attributes of God: For what other thing doth the two Books opened to us, *Psal.*19. The Book of Creation and Providence; and the Book of the Scripture, but manifest God in his nature and works, and mans misery and Redemption in Christ?

Now the Prelats and Papists devise a third blanke book of unwritten Traditions and mutable Ceremonials: We see no Warrant for this book: 4. *Hooker* maketh a man in many Morall Actions, as in *wearing a Surplice*, in many actions flowing *from concealed instincts of nature*, as in moving, sleeping, like either the Philosophers, Civilian or Morall Athiest, or like a beast to act things, or to do by the meer instinct of nature. Whereas being created according to Gods Image, especially, he living in the visible Church, he is to do all his actions deliberate, even naturall and morall in Faith, and with a Warrant from scripture, to make good their Morality, *Psa.* 119.9. *Prov.*3.23,24. 2 *Cor.*5.7. And truly *Formalists* give men in their Morals to live at random, and to walk, without *taking heed to their wayes, according to Gods Word.*

Book. 2. Eccl. pol. p. 54. Hooker. *It sufficeth that our Morall actions be framed, according to the Law of reason; the generall axiomes, rules, and principles of which being so frequent in holy Scripture, there is no let, but in that regard, even out of Scripture, such duties may be deduced by some kinde of consequence (as by long circuit of deduction it may be, that even all truth out of any truth may be concluded) howbeit no man be bound in such*

such sort to deduce all his actions out of Scripture, as if either the place be to him unknown, whereon they may be concluded, or the reference to that place, not presently considered of, the action shall in that be condemned as unlawfull.

Ans. 1. The Law of reason in Morals (for of such we now speak) is nothing but the Morall Law and will of God, contained fully in the Scriptures of the Old and *New Testament*; and therefore is not to be divided from the Scriptures; if a man be ruled in that, he is ruled by Scripture: for a great part of the Bible, of the Decalogue, is Printed in the reasonable soul of man: As when he loveth his Parents, obeyeth his superiors, saveth his Neighbour in extream danger of death, because *he doth these according to the Law of Reason*, shall it follow that these actions which are expresly called τὰ τῦ νόμυ, *Rom.* 2. 14. the things or duties of the Law, are not warranted by expresse Scripture, because they are done according to the Law of naturall reason? I should think the contrary most true. 2. *Such duties* (saith he) Morall duties (I hope he must mean) to God and our Neighbour, may be deduced *by some kinde of consequence out of Scripture*: But by what consequence? Such as to Argue, *Quidlibet ex quolibet*. The *Catechisme* taught me long ago of duties to God and my Neighbour, that they are taught in the *ten Commandments*. Now if some Morall duties to God and man be taught in the *ten Commandments*, and some not taught there: 1. Who made this distinction of duties? None surely but the Prelats and the Papists; if the Scripture warrant some duties to God and our Neighbour, and do not warrant some, the Scripture must be unperfect. 2. The warranting of actions that may be service to God, or will-worship, or homicide by no better ground then *Surplice* and *Crosse*, can be warranted, or by such a consequence, as you may deduce *all truth out of any truth*, is no warrant at all; the Traditions of Papists may thus be warranted. 3. Nor is the action to be condemned, as unlawfull in it self, because the agent cannot see by what consequence it is warranted by Scripture, it followeth only to him that so doth, it is unlawfull, *Rom.* 14. 14. In that he doth *Bonum, non benè, a thing lawfull, not lawfully*. 4. It is unpossible to *deduce all truth out of any truth*: For then because the Sun riseth to day, it should follow, *Ergo, Crosse and Surplice* are Lawfull: I might as well deduce the contrary, *Ergo*, they are unlawfull.

2. Book. p. 78. Hooker: *Some things are good in so mean a degree of goodnesse, that men are only not disproved, nor disallowed of God for them, as,* Eph. 5. 20. *No man hateth his own flesh,* Matth. 5. 46. *If ye do good unto them that do so to you, the very Publicans themselves do as much: They are worse then Infidels that provide not for their own,* 1 Tim. 5. 8. *The light of nature alone, maketh these actions in the sight of God allowable.* 2. *Some things are required to salvation by way of direct, immediate and proper necessity finall, so that without performance of them, we cannot in ordinary course be saved.---In these, our chiefest direction is from Scripture, for nature is no sufficient director what we should do to attain life Eternall.* 3. *Some things although not so required of necessity, that to leave them undone excludeth from salvation, are yet of so great dignity and acceptation with God, that most ample reward is laid up in Heaven for them,* as Matth. 10. *A Cup of cold Water shall not go unrewarded: And the first Christians sold their possessions, and* 1 Thess. 2. 7. 9. Paul *would not be burdensome to the* Thessalonians: *Hence nothing can be evil that God approveth, and he approveth much more then he doth Command, and the precepts of the law of Nature may be otherwise known then by the Scripture, then the bare mandat of Scripture is not the only rule of all good and evil, in the actions of Morall men.*

Ans. 1. The Popery in this Author (in disputing for a Platform of Government) that is up and down, and changeable at the will of men, made me first out of love with their way: for his first classe of things allowable by the light of Nature without Scripture, is far wide; for *Eph.* 5. 20. That a *man love his own flesh,* is Commanded in the sixth Commandment, and the contrary forbidden: otherwise for a man to kill himself, which is self-hatred, should not be forbidden in Scripture, the very light of nature alone will forbid ungratitude in Publicans, and condemn a man that *provideth not for his own*: But that this light of nature excludeth Scripture and the Doctrine of Faith, is an untruth: for *Hooker* leaveth out the words that are in the Text, and most against his cause: *He that provideth not for his own, is worse then an Infidel, and hath denied the Faith:* Ergo, the Doctrine of Faith commandeth a man to *provide for his own.* What Morall goodnesse nature teacheth, that same doth the Morall Law teach, so the one excludeth not the other. 2. It is false, that Scripture only as contradistinguished from the

Law

Law of Nature, doth direct us to Heaven: for both concurreth in a speciall manner, nor is the one exclusive of the other. 3. For his third classe its expretly the *Popish Works of supererogation*, of which *Hooker* and Papists both give two Characters. 1. *That they are not Commanded.* 2. *That they merit a greater degree of glory*: Both are false: To give *a Cup of cold water* to a needy Disciple, is commanded in Scripture, *Isa.* 57. 9, 10. *Matth.* 25. 41, 42. And the contrary punished with everlasting fire in Hell: For *Paul* not to be burdensome to the *Thessalonians*, and not to take stipend or wages for Preaching, is commanded, for considering the condition that *Paul* was in, was; 1 *Thess.* 2. 6. To seek glory of men, was a thing forbidden in Scripture, and so the contrary cannot be a thing not commanded; and not to be gentle, v. 7. As the *servant of God* ought to be, even to the enemies of the truth, 1 *Tim.* 2. 24. Not to *be affectionately desirous* to impart soul & Gospel and all, to those to whom he Preached, as it is v. 8. is a sin forbidden, and for the merit of increase of glory, it is a dream. Hence I draw an Argument against this mutable form of Government: The changeable Positives of this Government, such as *Crossing*, *Surplice* and the like, are none of these three enumerated by *Hooker*. 1. They are not warranted by the Law of nature, for then all Nations should know by the light of nature, that God is decently worshipped in *Crosse* and *linnen Surplice*, which is against experience. 2. That these Positives are not necessary to salvation, with a proper finall necessity, as I take, is granted by all. 3. I think *Crosse and Surplice*, cannot deserve a greater measure of glory: for *Formalists* deny either merit or efficacy to their Positives. The Jesuit *Tannerus*, confirmeth all which is said by *Hooker*, as did *Aquinas* before him: And *Eckius* in his conference with *Luther*, and *Oecolampadius*, who say, for imagery and their Traditions; that it is *sufficient that the Church say such a thing is truth and to be done, and the scripture doth not gain-say it.*

Works of Superogation holden by *Hooker.*

Tanner. in 22. to. 3. disp. 5. de Relig. q. 2. Dub. 3.

Aquinas 22. q. 25. Art. 3. *Quando dicitur adorationem imaginum, non esse Scriptam adeoque non esse licitam in cultu dei respondetur. Apostoli familiari spiritus instinctu quædam ecclesiis tradiderunt servanda, quæ non reliquerunt in scriptis; sed in observatione fidelium per successionem: Colloquio Helvetiorum ita.* Eckius, Collat. 44. concl. 4. *Audet (Hen. Linick dissert enim.* Cont. Luther, Zwinglium) *dicere deum in nostris imaginibus Christianis nullam habere Complacentiam: Quis hoc ei retulit, sacræ literæ non contradicunt.*

SECT.

SECT. V.

Morall Obedience resolved ultimately in Scripture.

FOR farther light in this point, it is a Question: What is the formall object of our obedience in all our our Morall actions? that is, Whether is the Faith practicall of our obedience, & the obedience itself, in all the externals of Church Government resolved in this ultimately and finally. *This and this we do, and this point of Government we believe and practise: because the Lord hath so appointed it, in an immutable Platform of Government in Scripture:* or because the Church hath so appointed, or because there is an intrinsecall conveniency in the thing it self, which is discernable by the light of nature? *Ans.* This Question is near of blood to the Controversie between Papists and us, concerning the formall object of our faith: that is, Whither are we to believe the scripture to be the Word of God, because so saith the *Church*: or upon this objective ground, because the Lord so speaketh in his own Word: Now we hold, that scripture it self furnisheth light and faith of it self, from it self; and that the Church doth but hold forth the light: as I see the light of the Candle, because of the light it self, not because of the Candlestick. Hence in this same very Question, the Iews were not to believe, that the smallest pin of the Tabernacle, or that any officer, *High-Priest*, *Priest* or *Levite*, were necessary, nor were they to obey in the smallest Ceremoniall observance; because *Moses* and the Priests or Church, at their godly discretion, without Gods own speciall warrant said so: But, *because so the Lord spake to Moses*, so the Lord gave in writing to *David* and *Solomon*, 1 *Chron.* 28. 11. 19. And so must it be in the Church of the New Testament, in all the Positives of Government; otherwise, if we observe *Saints-dayes*, and believe *Crossing and Surplice*, hath this Religious signification, because the Church saith so; then is our obedience of conscience finally resolved in the Testimony of men so speaking, at their own discretion without any warrant of scripture. 2. To believe and obey in any Religious Positives, because it is the pleasure of men so to Command, is to be servants of men, and to make their will the formall reason of our obedience, which is unlawfull. If it be said, that we are to believe and Practise many things in naturall necessity, as to eat, move, sleep, and many circumstantials of Church-Policy, because the Law of naturall reason saith so; and because there

Whither our obedience in Church-policy, be ultimately resolved in *this faith the Lord*, or in *this* faith the church.

is

is an intrinsecall conveniency, and an aptitude to edifie, & to decore and beautifie in an orderly and a decent way the service of God, and not simply, *because the Church saith so*, nor yet *because the Lord speaketh so in the Scripture*, and therefore all our obedience is not Ultimately and finally resolved into the Testimony of the Scripture. I Answer, That there be some things that the Law of Nature commandeth, as to move, eat, sleepe; and here with leave I distinguish *Factum*, the common practise of men from the *jus*, what men in conscience ought to do, as concerning the former, morall and naturall mens practise is all resolved in their own carnall will, and lusts, and so they eat, move and sleep, because nature, and carnall will, leadeth them thereinto, not because God in the Law of nature (which I humbly conceive to be a part of the first elements and principles of the Morall Law, or Decalogue, and so a part of Scripture) doth so warrant us to do; and therefore the moving, eating, drinking of naturall *Moralists*, are materially lawfull and conforme to scripture, for God by the Law of nature commandeth both Heathen men, and pure *Moralists* within the visible Church, to do naturall acts of this kinde; because the Lord hath revealed that to be his will in the Book of nature: But these Heathen do these acts, because they are suitable to their Lusts and carnall will, and not because God hath commanded them so to do in the Book of nature; and this is their sin in the manner of doing though materially, *Et quod substantiam actus*, the action be good; and the same is the sin of naturall men within the visible Church, and a greater sin; for God not only commandeth them in the Law of nature, but also in Scripture to do all these naturall acts, because God hath revealed his will in these naturall actions, as they are morall to naturall men within the visible Church, both in the Law of nature, and in the scripture, and *De jure* they ought to obey, because God so commandeth in both; and in regard all within the visible Church, are obliged to all naturall actions in a spirituall way, though their eating, moving, sleeping be lawfull materially, *Et quoà substantiam actus*, yet because they do them without any the least habituall reference to God, so commanding in natures Law and scripture, they are, in the manner of doing, sinfull; otherwise *Formalists* go on with Papists and Arminians to justifie the actions of the unregenerated, as simply Lawfull and good, though performed by them with

no

no respect to God or his Commandment: 2. As concerning actions of *Church-Policy*, that cannot be warranted by the light of nature, and yet have intrinsecall conveniency and aptitude to edifie and decently to Accomodate the worship of God. I conceive these may be done, but not because the Church so commandeth, as if their commandment were the formall reason of our obedience, but because partly the light of the Law of reason, partly scripture doth warrant them; but that Crosse and Surplice can be thus warranted is utterly denied: Again I conceive that there be two sort of positives in the externals of Government or worship: 1. *S*ome Divine, as that there be in the Publique Worship, Prayers, Praising, Preaching, Sacraments, and these are substantials; that there be such Officers, Pastors, Teachers, Elders and Deacons; that there be such censures, as rebuking, Excommunication and the like, are morally Divine, or Divinely Morall: and when the *Church* formeth a *Directory* for worship and Government, the *Directory* it self is in the Form not simply Divine. And if it be said that neither the Church of the Jews, nor the *Church Apostolique had more a Written Directory, nor they had a Written Leiturgy or book of Common Prayers or Publick Church-service*: I answer, nor had either the Iewish or *Apostolick Church* any written Creed or systeme, written of fundamentall Articles, such as is that, which is commonly called the *Apostolick Creed*; but they had materially in the scripture the Apostolick Creed; and the Directory they had also the same way, for they practised all *the Ordinances directed*, though they had no written *Directory* in a formall contexture or frame: for Prayers, Preaching, Praising, *S*acraments and Censures never Church wanted in some one order or other, though we cannot say that the Apostolick Church had this same very order and forme: But a Leiturgy which is a commanded, imposed, stinted Form, in such words and no other, is another thing then a Directory as an unlawfull thing is different from a Lawfull: 2. There be some things Positive humane, as the Ordering of some parts, or worship, or Prayer, the forme of words or phrases, and some things of the Circumstantials of the *Sacrament*, as what Cups, Wood or Mettall, in these the Directory layeth a tie upon no man, nor can the Church in this make a *Directory* to be a *Church Compulsory* to strain men: And this way the Directory is not ordered and commanded in the frame and contexture,

Two things in the externall worship. 1. Substantials. 2. Accidentals.

as

as was the *Service-Book*; and the Pastor or people in these are not properly Morall Agents, nor do we presse that scripture should regulate men in these. But sure in *Crossing*, in *Surplice* men must be Morall Agents, no lesse then in eating and drinking at the *Lords-Supper*, and therefore they ought to be as particularly regulated by Scripture in the one, as in the other.

Quest. But who shall be judge of these things which you say are Circumstantials only, as time, place, &c. and of these that *Formalists* say are adjuncts and Circumstances of worship, though also they have a Symbolicall and Religious signification: must not the Church judge, what things are indifferent, what necessary, what are expedient, what Lawfull? *Answer*, There is no such question imaginable, but in the Synagogue of *Antichrist*; For as concerning *Norma judicandi*, the *Rule of judging*, without all exception, the scripture ought to be the only rule and measure of all practicall truths, how *Formalists* can make the Scripture the rule of judging of unwritten *Ceremonies* which have no warrant in Scripture, more then Papists can admit scripture to regulate and warrant their unwritten *Traditions*, I see not, we yield that the Church is the Politick, Ministeriall, and visible judge of things necessary and expedient, or of things not necessary and expedient: But we know no such question in this Controversie, as who shall be judge: but supposing the Church to be a ministeriall judge, and the Scripture the infallible Rule, the question is, whether this judge have any such power, as to prescribe Laws touching things indifferent, and to injoyne these, though they have no warrant from Scripture, as things necessary, and to binde where God hath not bound.

The question who should be judge of things necessary or indifferent is nothing to the present controversie.

Quest. But doth not the *Church* determine things, that of themselves are indifferent; as whether Sermon should begin at nine of clock, or ten in the morning, and after the Church hath past a determination for the dyet of ten a clock, the indifferency of either nine or ten is removed, and the practise without any warrant of Scripture restricted to one, for order and peace sake; and why may not the like be done in Positives of Church-Government? *Ans.* The truth is, the Church by her will putteth no determination on the time, but only ministerially declareth that which Gods providence accomodating it self to the season, climate, the conveniency

of the congregation as they lie in distance from the place of meeting, hath determined already: But neither Providence, scripture, nor naturall reason hath determined, that there should be in every *Diocesan Church* a Monarch-Prelate, Pastor of Pastors, with majority of power of jurisdiction and ordination over Pastors, more then there should be one Pope, Catholick Pastor of the Catholick visible Church, or that *Crossing* should betoken Dedication to *Christs service*, only will as will must determine positive Religious observances, such as these are.

SECT. VI.

What Honour, Praise, Glory, Reverence, Veneration, Devotion, Service, Worship, &c. are.

FOr the more clear opening of the ensuing Treatise, it is necessary to speak somewhat of *Worship* and *Adoration*, and especially of these, 1. *Honour.* 2. *Praise.* 3. *Glory*, 4. *Reverence.* 5. *Veneration.* 6. *Devotion.* 7. *Religion.* 8. *Service.* 9. *Worship.* 10. *Love.* 11. *Obedience.* 12. *Adoration.* 1. *Honour, is a testification of the excellency of any*, Arist. Ethic. l. 8. c. 8. Aquinas. *Honos est signum quoddam excellentiæ.* Honour is a signe or expression of Excellency in any, it doth not import any superiority in the party whom we honor, as *Adoration* doth. *Praise*, is a speciall honouring of any, consisting in words. *Glory*, is formally the effect of *Honour*, though it be taken, *Pro claritate*, for the celebrity or renownednesse of any; yet *glory* seemeth to be founded upon celebrity, as its foundation. *Reverence* is a sort of *Veneration* of a person for excellency connorating a sort of fear. *Veneration* is a sort of fear, and reverencing of a person: I see not well any difference between *Reverence* and *Veneration*, except that *Veneration* seemeth to be some more, and cometh nearer to *Adoration*: *Devotion* is the promptitude, cheerfulnesse, or spirituall propension of the will to serve God; *Religion* is formally in this, when a man subjecteth himself to God, as to his supreame Lord, and thence ariseth to give him honour, as his God, and absolute Lord. The two integral parts of Religion, are the subjection of the reasonable creature to God. 2. An exhibition of honour; if any object *that the subjection of the creature to God is humility, not Religion, Raphael de la Torres* in 22. tom. 1. de obj. adorat. q. 81. art. 1. disp. unic. n. 8. answereth that subjection to God, as it issueth from a prin-

1. Honour.
2. Praise.
3. Glory.
4. Reverence.
5. Veneration.
6. Devotion.
7. Religion
8. Service.
9. Worship
10. Love.
11. Adoration, what they are.

a principle of tendering due Honour to God for his excellency, its Religion; but as it abandoneth the passion of hope in the way of attaining honour, it is an act of humility to God, as the giving of money for the paying of debt, is an act of justice; but as it is given to moderate the desire of money, it is an act of Liberality. The acts of Religion are of two sorts, some internall and elicite, as to *Adore, Sacrifice, Pray*, by these a man is rightly ordered toward the Honouring of God only: But there be other acts imperated and Commanded by Religion, which flow immediately from other vertues, as it may be from mercy and compassion to our brother, but are Commanded by Religion, as *Jam.* 1. 27. *Pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, to visit the fatherlesse and the Widows, &c. Service* is from the bond of subjection, to reverence God as an inferior or servant doth his Lord and Master: A servant doth properly do the will of his Master, for the gain or profit that redoundeth to his Master; but, because we cannot be profitable to the Almighty by way of gain; therefore we are to serve him in relation to an higher end, then accession of gain (of which the Lord is not capable, *Psal.* 16. 2. *Iob* 22. 3.) For the declaration of his glory: For Worship formally is to give reverence to God for his excellency; in one and the same act we may both Worship God and serve him. Only service doth include the obligation of a servant to a Lord. As concerning *Love, Faith and Hope*, they are internall Worship, not properly *Adoration*: Love as Love doth rather import an equality with the thing loved, and a desire of an Union, rather then a submission. It is true, there is a perfection in that which we Love, but not essentially to perfect the Lover, that possibly may agree to the Love between man and man, but not to Love as Love: for the Father Loves Christ his Son, and did delight in him from eternity; *Prov.* 8. 30. A superior Angel may Love an inferior; yet the Father cannot be perfected by Loving Christ, nor a superior Angel, by Loving any inferior; *Faith* and *Hope* may suppose a resting on a helper as a helper, and so are internall Worship; if they be adoration formally may be a Question.

Two acts of Religion, imperated, or commanded, and elicite.

It is an untruth which *Raphael de la Torres*, with other schoolmen say, *That with the same Religion by which we Honour holy men, we Honour God; upon this reason, because holinesse in them is a participation of the Divine Nature, therefore God must be the intrinsecall*

Raphael. to. 1. in 22. q. 81. Art. 4. disp. vnica.

Honoring of Holy men is not worship.

end, and formall reason, for which We Honour the Saints. For Holinesse in Saints, is a participation of the Divine nature; but it is a Temporary and a created participation, it is not the same very holinesse that is in God; but the created effect thereof: and so the Love I bear to any Creature, because there is somewhat of God in every Creature; And the Love to our Neighbour, Commanded in the second Table of the Law, should be the Love of God, Commanded in the first Table of the Law. 2. When I bow to the gray-haired, and to the King; I then do an act of obedience to the fifth Commandment: No man can say, that when I bow to the King, or to an holy man, that I am then bowing to the God of heaven, and Worshipping God: No acts terminated upon Saints living or dead, are acts of Worshipping God; yea, reverencing of the Ordinances of God, as the delighting in, or trembling at the Word, are not properly acts of adoring God.

Obedience. *Obedience* is founded, not formally upon Gods excellency, properly so called; but upon his jurisdiction and Authority to Command.

Adoration. *Adoration* is the subjection or prostration of soul or body to God in the due recognition and acknowledgement of his absolute supremacy. There is no need, that *Vasquez* should deny, that there is any internall *Adoration*, for that *Adoration* is only an externall and bodily Worship of God, can hardly be defended; for there may be, and is *Adoration* in the blessed Angels, as may be gathered from *Isa.* 6. 1,2,3. *Heb.* 1. 6. And it is hard to say, that the glorified spirits loosed out of the body, and received by Christ, *Act.* 7. 59. *Psal.* 73. 27. Into Paradice, *Luk.* 23. 43. And so with him, *Philip.* 1. 23. And Praying under the Altar, *Rev.* 6. 9, 10. And falling down before the Lamb, and acknowledging that he hath Redeemed them, *Rev.* 5. 8,9,10. do not Adore God and his Son Christ; because they have not bodies and knees to bow to him, and yet they Adore him, *Phil.* 2. 9,10. in a way suitable to their spirituall estate. It is an untruth that *Rapha. de la Torres*, in 22. q. 84. Art. 2. disp. 2. n. 1. saith, *That Protestants detest all externall Worship now under the New Testament, as contrary to Grace, and Adoration of God in spirit and truth.* For things subordinate are not contrary; we should deny the necessity of *Baptisme*, and *the Lords Supper*, and of vocall praying and praising under the New Testament, which are in their externals,

externals, external worship. I grant internall Adoration, is more hardly known: But 'tis enough for us to say, as externall Adoration is an act by which we offer our bodies to God, and subject the utter man to him, in sign of service and reverence to so supream a Lord; so there is a heart-prostration, and inward bowing of the soul, answerable thereunto.

As the profession, whither actuall or habituall, in a locall and bodily approach, or in verball titles of Honour, in which we Honour great personages, by bowing to them, *in prostration* and *kneeling*, is an act in its state Civill, not Religious, we intending (I presse not the necessity of a formall or actuall intention) only to conciliate Honour to them, suitable to their place and dignity: so a profession, whither actuall or habituall, in a Religious bodily approach to God, either by prayer or prostration, or inclination of the body tending to the Honour of God is a Religious act. Now bodily prostration of it self, is a thing in its nature indifferent, and according as is the object, so is it either Artificiall: as if one should stoop down to drive a wedge in an image; or civill, if one bow to Honour the King; or Religious, when God and Divine things are the object thereof: But with this difference, the intention of the minde, added to externall prostration to a creature reasonable, may make that prostration idolatrous, and more then civill honour. Thus bowing to *Haman*, Honoured by *Ahasuerus*, who hath power to confer honours, if people bow to him as to God, is more then civill honour: And *Cornelius* his bowing to *Peter*, *Act.* 10. as to more then a man, is Idolatrous, and not civill honour; and the Carpenters bowing to an Image, as to a piece of Timber formed by Art, is only Artificiall bowing; and if any stumble at a stone before an Image, and so fall before it, it is a casuall and naturall fall; whereas a falling down with intention to Adore, had been Religious Adoring: But when the object of bodily prostration or kneeling, is God, or any Religious representation of God, whither it be the elements of bread and wine, which are Lawfull Images of Christ, or devised pictures or portraicts of God or *Christ*; because these objects are not capable of artificiall, naturall, or civill prostration, if therefore they be terminating objects of bodily kneeling or prostration; these Religious objects, to wit, *God, and Religious things*, must so specifie these bodily acts, as that they must make them Religious, not civill acts, though

The Religious object, with the act of reverencing, maketh adoration to be Religious; but a civill object, except the intention concur maketh not Religious adoration of a civill object.

though there be no intention to bow to God; for bowing to God hath from the object, that it is a Religious bowing, though you intend not to direct that bowing to God, as bowing to *Jupiters* Portraict, is a Religious Worshipping of that Portraict, though you intend not to worship the Portraict: for the act and Religious object together, maketh the act of prostration or kneeling, to be essentially Religious, though there be no intention to bow to these; indeed the intention to bow to God, maketh kneeling to God to be more Morally good, laudable and acceptable before God, then if there were no such intention, but the want of the intention, maketh it not to be no Religious worship, nor can it make it to be civill worship. Hence let this be observed, that intention of bowing can, or may change that bowing which otherwayes were but civill (if there were no such intention of over-esteeming the creature) into a Religious bowing, but neither our over or under-intention can change a Religious kneeling to God, or to an Image into a civill kneeling, because civill or naturall bowing to creatures, is more under the power of an humane and voluntary institution of men, then Religious bowing, which hath from God without any act of mans free will, its compleat nature. When we kneel to Kings, we signifie by that gesture, that we submit our selves to higher powers, not simply (saith *P. Martyr.*) but in so far as they Command not things against the Word of the Lord. When we Adore God, we Adore him as the Supream Majesty, being ready to obey him in what he shall Command, without any exception; the *Adoration* of men, signifieth a submission limited, if it go above bounds, it is the sinfull intention of the Adorer, who may change the civil Adoration into Religious, and may ascend: But the *Adoration* of God cannot so descend, as it can turn into *Civill Adoration*, only keeping the same object it had before.

Martyr, comment. in 1 *King.* c. 1. v. 16.

What worship is?

Worship is an action, or performance, or thing, by which we tender our immediate honour to God, from the nature of the thing it self: 1. I call it an action, because the passion of dying or suffering, is not formally worship; but only dying comparatively, rather then denying of *Christ*, or dying so, and so qualified, dying with *Patience* and *Faith*, may be called a worship. 2. I call it not an action only, but *a performance or thing*; because an office, as the *Priesthood*, the Ministery is a worship, and yet not an action; Sometime,

time, *Time* it self, as the Sabbath Day is a Worship; yet it is not an action: So the Lord calleth it *His Holy Day:* and undenyably the *Iewish dayes*, the *High Priests garment*, and many things of that kinde, were Divine or Religious performances, things, or adjuncts of Divine Worship, but so, as they are not meerly adjuncts of *Worship*, but also *Worship*; for the *High Priests Ephod* was not only a civil ornament, nor was it a meer Physicall or naturall means to fence off the injuries of sun, and Heaven, we do not think that the Lord in all, or any place of the *Old* or *New Testament* setteth down any Laws concerning garments simply, as they do fence off cold or heat, that belongeth to Art, only he speaketh of garments as contrary to gravity, as signes of vanity and lightnesse, *Isa.*3.16, &c. *Zepha.*1.8. 1 *Pet.*3.3,4. And of garments as Religious observances, of which sort was the attire and garments of the Priests and High-Priests in their service, in which consideration the Religious times, holy places, and *Mosaicall* garments were *Divine Worship*, by which God was immediatly honored, but not adjuncts only, or actions; but Religious things or performances. 3. It is such a performance, as from thence honour doth immediatly redound to God, but that this may be the clearer; I conceive that there is a twofold immediate honouring of God, in the worship of God: 1. An honouring of God lesse immediate, as hearing of the word, is an immediate honouring of God, because honour floweth immediatly from God, both *Ex conditione operis*, and *Ex conditione operantis*; from the nature of the work, and intention of the worker: yet it is a lesse immediate honouring of God, in regard, that I may also hear the word even from the condition of the work, and so from the intrinsecall end of the worker, that I may learn to know God, and believe, for thus far I am led to honour God immediatly in hearing the word; that action of its own nature conveying honour to God; there interveeneth also a *medium* amidst: between me and the honouring of God, to wit, the Preacher, or the Bible; to which no externall adoration is due: There is another more immediate worship, to wit, praising of God, from which by an immediate result, God is honoured, and in worship especially strictly immediate, God is immediatly honoured both in the intention of the work, and the intrinsecall end of it, and the intention of the worker; though no other thing be done, and others be not

Worship is an immediate honoring of God, but some worship honoreth him more immediately, some lesse.

not edified either in knowledge, increase of Faith, or any other wayes: And in this, duties of the second Table, of mercy and justice, differ from worship, in that such acts of love and mercy, as to give almes to save the life of my brother, or of his beast, are not acts of worshipping God; their intrinsecall end, and the nature of the work being to do good to the creature, principally, *Ex naturâ, & conditione operis*, though God also thereby be honoured; yet in a more secundary consideration: For I praying to God, do immediately from the nature of the action honour God, though no good should either redound to my self, or to the creature; thereby, it is true, God, by acts of love and mercy to our neighbour, is honoured two wayes: 1. In that men seeing our good works do thence take occasion to glorifie our Heavenly Father, whose truth teacheth us by the grace of God to do these works, but the intrinsecall and proper use of these, is to do good to our selves, as in works of sobriety, and to our neighbour, as in works of righteous dealing, but not immediatly, and in the first and primary consideration to honour God, as in works of Piety, holinesse and worship, the honouring of God by secondary resultance, doth issue also from these duties of righteousnesse, but not as from the acts of praying, praising, Sacramentall eating, drinking. 2. The doer of these acts of mercy, may, and is to intend the honouring of God.

A twofold intention in worship.

There is a twofold intention in worship, one formall and properly *Religious*, and is expounded Morall, *Ex naturâ rei*, to be Religious, it being such an intention, as can have no other state in worship, but a *Religious State*, as if the three *Children* should bow at the Commmandment of the *King of Babylon*, though intending to worship the true God. Here should be an intrinsecall intention, *Ex naturâ & conditione operis*, to worship, and that from two grounds conjoyned together: 1. Here is bowing down: 2. Bowing down to a *Religious Object*, commanded by a *Prince*, and so cometh under the Morall notion of the command of a Judge. When the object of bowing down is Religious, the signication that we give divine honour to God by kneeling is as inseparable (saith *Raphael de la Torres*) from kneeling or bowing down, as a bearing testimony by word, that God is true, and knoweth all secrets, and will be avenged on perjury, is inseparable from vocall swearing by the name of *God*, or as any man should be an Idolater, who

who in expresse words should say to an Idol, *O my God* Jupiter *help me*, though that Adoration were fained, and he who so prayeth, should in his heart abhor and detest *Jupiter* and all false Gods: But there is another intention not Religious; if a Childe reade a Chapter of the Bible, that he may learn to read and spell, that is an action of Art, not of Worship; becaus the object of the Childes reading, is not Scripture as Scripture, but only the Printed Characters as they are, *Signa rerum ut rerum, non ut rerum sacrarum*, signes of things, not of holy things, and here the object not being Religious, the intrinsecall operation cannot raise up any Religious intention of the Childe. Upon this ground, it is easie to determine whether or no an intention of Worship be essentiall to Worship or not, the former intention which is intrinsecall, and *Intentio operis*, may be essentiall, it resulting from the object; but the latter intention of the worker, is so far extraneous to Worship, as whether it be, or be not, the nature of Worship is not impaired nor violated.

De la Tor. tom. 2. in 22. q. 94. Art. 2. *Si quis interpellarit idolum dicens expressis verbis, Jupiter, deus meus adjuva me, quamvis conarctur fingere istam invocationem, detestans interius Jovem, et omnes falsos deos, verè idolatra esset, quia ab illis verbis inseparabilis est significatio exhibendi cultum Divinum idolo.*

Hence, Adoration is worship; But every worship is not Adoration. Uncovering the head, seemeth to be little older then *Pauls* Epistles to the *Corinthians*. The Learned *Salmasius*, thinketh it but a Nationall sign of honour, no wayes universally received: But certainly it is not Adoration: Though therefore we receive the Supper of the Lord uncovered, no man can conclude from thence Adoration of the Elements, as we do from kneeling conclude the same, as we shall here for all bodily worship or expression of our affection to the means of graces (though these means be but creatures) is not Adoration properly either of God, or of these means, it is Lawfull to tremble at the word, and for *Josiah* to weep before the Book of the Law read, and for the Martyrs to kisse the Stake, as the Instrument by which they glorified God, in dying for the truth; all these being *Objectam quo*, and means by the which they conveyed their worship to the true God, and naturall and Lawfull expressions of their affection to God: For uncovering the head, it is a sort of Veneration or Reverence, not Adoration; and *Paul* insinuateth so much when he saith, 1 *Cor.* 11. 4. *Every man praying and prophecying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head:* But it is not his meaning, that he dishonoreth God. 2. The *Jewes* to this day, as of old, used not uncovering the head as a sign of honour: But by the contrary, covering was a sign of honour: If therefore

Vncovering of the head, is Veneration, not Adoration.

the *Jews*, being made a visible *Church*, shall receive the Lords Supper, and Pray and Prophecy with covered heads, men would judge it no dishonouring of their head, or not of dis-respect of the Ordinances of God: Though *Paul* having regard to a Nationall Custome in *Corinth*, did so esteem of it.

Corduba, l. 1. q. 5. dub. 6.

Antonius Corduba a Franciscan, enumerateth nine externall acts of Adoration, but speaketh nothing of uncovering the head; as 1. *Sacrificing*. 2. *Martyrdome*. 3. *Giving and Receiving the Sacraments*. 4. *Suiting of Pardon*. 5. *Suiting of Grace*. 6. *Smiting the breast*. 7. *Building of Churches*. 8. *Institution of Feasts*. 9. *Vows and Oaths*. Prelaticall *Formalists* side with them, in Building and Consecrating of Churches, and Holy-dayes, which are but will-worship, as used by them: And for *Martyrdome*, it is formally an act of Christian fortitude, not worship, the confession of Gods truth a Concomitant of Martyrdome, is indeed worship. How suiting of Pardon, and suiting of Grace are two externall acts of Adoration, I see not: for by this way, if we regard the multitude of things that we suit, there should be moe then two: *Consecrating of Churches* is taken two wayes: 1. For a meer dedication or Civill destination of any thing to its end and use: As when a house is builded, a garment is first put on, when we refresh our selves with a draught of water, we may pray for a blessing on these, and on all the Creatures for our use, and the very habituall intention of the builder of an house to dwell in, is a Civill dedication of it to that use for which it is Ordained. Prayer added to it for a blessing of it in the use, maketh not a Consecrated thing; for then my clothes every day put on, my sleep, my dayly walking in and out, my Physick, my meals, my horse, my ship I sail in, should all be Holy, Consecrated, and Religious things, which I were to Reverence as Religious things; for all these may be blessed in their use: But here is that we condemn in Religious dedication of Churches: 1. That the end being sacred, to wit, the habituall worshipping of God in that place. 2. The praying for the Church or house of worship, to say nothing of the vain Ceremonies used in the dedication of Churches: These two are applyed to make the Church holy, and to denominate it the house of God, and capable of Religious veneration, and salutation: Then certainly, all the Synagogues of *Judea*, should be Religiously holy, as was the Temple. 2. And Prayers should be more acceptable

Consecration of Churches taken two wayes.

Consecration of Churches condemned

able to God in the Synagogue for the houses sake, then prayers in any other place. 3. God shall binde himself by promise to hear prayers in the Synagogue, or made with the face toward the Synagogue, as he did toward the Temple: we were obliged in the New Testament to pray with our faces toward the Churches or meeting places in the *New Testament*, and we should have one famous and celebrious Church for all Iews and Gentiles, more holy then all the little holy Temples now consecrated as holy places, and where shall this be? And what typicall signification shall it have? It must signifie *Christ to come*, or already come, both is unlawfull.

2. Again, if habituall Dedication by vertue of Prayer make a place holy, by the same reason actuall Dedication should make a place holy; and the belly of the Whale should have been holy because there *Jonah* prayed, and every place a believer prayeth shall be holy, his closet, a private corner of his Orchard or Garden where he prayeth shall be holy, for these may be habitually destined and appointed (if you call this Dedication) for prayer only, and it shall be unlawfull to do any civill businesse there, more then it is unlawfull (as *Formalists* teach) to do any other civil businesse in the *Churches*, or places of meeting in the *New-Testament*: 3. God himself appointed the place, the Time when it should be built, the person, by whom, by *Solomon*, not *David*; the length, the breadth, the Chambers, Porches, Ornaments of the only holy place at *Jerusalem*; he hath no where appointed and prescribed these for the meeting places of the *New Testament*, but hath said that all places are alike, as touching any Religious holinesse, *Joh.*4.23. 1 *Tim.*2.8. 4. Shall we think God is not acceptably served, and that the Synagogues of the Iews, of which we read not any patern or rule for Dedication, are Prophane, because they are not Dedicated by the Bishops laying the first foundation stone of the house? Or because they want the ornaments of whorish Ceremonies; that *Durandus* enumerateth? or because they have not the surpassing beauty of admirable Temples, that Christians now a *little overswelling with the zeal* of prosperity builded for the worship of God, out of superlative detestation of *Diocletian*, and *Maximinus*, who had demolished all the Churches which Christians had leave to build under tollerable Emperors, such as *Severus*, *Gordianus*, *Philip*, and

Durand. Rati. l. 1. c. 6. Eusebius, l. 8. c. 8. 9, l. 10. c. 2, 3.

Galienus, as *Eusebius* teacheth? Or that we are to give a Testimony of as cheerfull affection for the beautifying of Temples, void of all typicall relation to the glory of Iesus Christ, as *David* did show, 1 *Chron.*28,14. 2 *Chron.*2.5. And that it is Morall and perpetually obligatory under the *New Testament*; that we bestow charges upon sumptuous Temples, upon these fancied grounds of Master *Hooker*? For his first Morall ground is, *Nothing is too dear to be bestowed about the furniture of Gods service*: 2. *Because sumptuous Temples serve to the world for a witnesse of his almightinesse, whom we outwardly serve, and honour with the chiefest of outward things, as being of all things himself incomparably the greatest*: 3. *It were strange, that God should have made such store of glorious creatures on earth, & leave them all to be consumed on secular vanity, allowing none but the baser sort to be imployed in his own service*: 4. *Rarest and most gorgeous treasures are too little for earthly Kings.* 5. *If the corruptible Temples of the holy Spirit are to be served with rich almes, what should be done for houses to edifie the living Temples redeemed by Iesus Christ*: To all which I say: 1. The Temple of *Ierusalem* in its glory, proportion and beauty, was a Positive worship, and so must be warranted by the positive Warrant of the Word, and the like Warrant must all our Churches in the New-Testament have: 2. If we must extend our liberality and bounty towards God to the highest, and to testifie the greatnesse and Almightinesse of him whom we serve: then did *David* and *Solomon* in both fail, there were more glorious and rich houses on earth, and divers times have been builded to the honour of false gods, and to declare the Royall magnificence of mortall Kings: God never for his own honour appointed such a banquet as *Ahasueroſh* did, to continue for an hundred and fourscore dayes, *Esther* 1.4. More might, and ought to have been done by *David* and *Solomon*, if it had been a morall ground to build a house, *to be a witnesse of Almightinesse*: 3. And God appointed sacrifices, and Sacraments in both Testaments, as Testimonies of the great *Lord Iesus*; yet in base and obvious creatures; we may not devise Symbols or witnessing Images of the Almightinesse of that God whom we serve, at our pleasure: 4. If our Lord *love mercy better then Sacrifice*, especially under the New Testament, when his worship must be more spirituall: Then the Argument may be strongly retorted, we are to bestow more on feeding the

*Hooker.*eccl. pol. 5.book p,208. Mr. *Hookers* fancied Morall grounds of the holinesse of Churches under the New Testament answered.

the living Members of Christs body (which yet is not secular vanity) then on dead stones; except Master *Hooker* can warrant us to serve God under the *New Testament* in precious stones and gold, for which we can see no Warrant: 5. All these Arguments are broadly used by *Papists*, for Images and rich *Churches*: Nor doth *Hooker* give us any Argument for this, but what *Papists* gave before him: *Have ye not houses* (saith he) *to eat and drink in*; Ergo, *He teacheth a difference between house and house, and what is fit for the dwelling place of God, and what for mans habitation, the one for common food, the other for none but for heavenly food.*

The place 1 Cor 11. *Have ye not houses*, &c. Make thno-thing for hallowing of Churches.

Ans. That there was publick meeting places and Churches in *Corinth*, now under Heathen Rulers, 1 *Cor.* 6. is denyed, by all both *Protestant* and *Popish* writers, far lesse had they then any consecrated *Churches*, and from the inconveniency of taking their Supper while some were full and drunk in the place where the Lords Supper was Celebrated, whereas they ought to have Supped in their own houses: to infer that the Church is a holier place, then their own house, I professe is Logick, I do not understand, it only concludes these two sort of houses are destinated from two sort of different uses, sacred and prophane and no more.

Neither am I much moved at that, *Psal.* 74. which is said, *ver.* 8. *They have burnt all the convening places, or all the Congregations of God in the land*: Vatablus, expoundeth it of the Temple: *Exusserunt totum Templum Dei terrenum*: Or all the question will be, why the Synagogues are called Gods Synagogues, as they called the Temple, *Ier.* 74. היכל יהוה The Temple of the Lord, and בית יהוה, *The house of the Lord*: Whither because every Synagogue was no lesse in its own kinde a house holy to the Lord then the Temple: Certainly there is no rationall ground to say, that Synagogues were Typicall, that the people were to pray with their faces toward the Synagogue, and to offer Sacrifices in the Synagogue: But that a Synagogue is called the house of God, from the use and end, because it was ordained for the worship of God, as that which God hath appointed for a speciall end and work, in that the Lord assumeth the propriety thereof to himself, so saith the Lord of *Cyrus*, *Isa.* 45. 1. *Thus saith the Lord to his Anointed, to Cyrus whose right hand I have holden*; yet was not *Cyrus* Typically, or Religiously holy, as the Temple of *Jerusalem*, and c. 44. v. 28. He

כל-מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל Nor the place, Psal. 74. 8.

saith

The Synagogue not Godshouse as the Temple was.

saith of *Cyrus*, *He is my shepherd*: and why? *He shall perform all my pleasure*, so Hos. 2.9. *Therefore will I returne* (*saith God*) *and take away my corne in the time thereof, and my wine in the season thereof, and will recover my wool and my flax* (*given*) *to cover her nakednesse*, To say nothing that all the holy land was Gods land, *Hos.* 9.3. *They shall not dwell in the Lords land*; and consequently all the *Synagogues* were *Gods houses*; and the enemy of whom the Church complaineth to God in that Psalme, was thus bold, as notwithstanding *Canaan* was *Gods Heritage* and proper Land in a speciall manner, yet it was destroyed and burnt by the enemies, even these houses that *God* was worshipped in, not being spared; But how God was so present in every Synagogue, and that even when there were no actuall worship of *God* in it, as he was in the Temple, and that it was so holy a place, as they were to put off there shooes who came into the *Synagogue*, *God* shewing his own immediate presence in every synagogue, as he did, *Exod.* 3.5. To *Moses* in the burning bush, *Exod.* 5.1. v.12. Is a thing that hath no warrant in the word of *God*; for if every synagogue had been thus holy: 1. It should have been a house dedicated to God in a Religious way, as was the Temple: 2. God should dwell in every *Synagogue* then, & in every Church under the New Testament now, as he said he would dwell in the Temple. 3. Then must Heathens and the uncircumcised be forbidden to come into any *Synagogue*, or any Church under the New Testament, the contrary whereof was evident in scripture; none were forbidden to enter in the *Synagogues*, *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 14.23,24. alloweth that Heathens come into the Churches or meetings where Christians are worshipping God. 4. If either the Temple of *Ierusulem* was holy for the worship in it, or for that it was a Type of our Materiall Temples under the New Testament, then our Churches under the New Testament shall be more holy, yea, our private houses in which we may worship *God* shal be more holy, as our worship is more spirituall then carnall Commandments of the Leviticall Law were, and the body must be more holy then the shadow; yea, all the earth now from the rising of the sun, to the going down of the same, in regard of more spirituall worship, even the *Stables* and *Alehouses*, where we may offer the Incense of Prayer to God, and offer the sacrifices of praises, *Mal.* 1.11. shall be alike holy, as either our Churches or the Temple was of old.

SECT.

Cap. I.

Q. 1. *Whether or not Humane Ceremonies in Gods Worship, can consist with the perfection of Gods Word?*

THese humane Ceremonies we cannot but reject upon these grounds;

Our first Argument is: Every positive and Religious observance, and Rite in Gods worship, not warranted by Gods Word, is unlawfull: But humane Ceremonies are such: *Ergo,* Arg. 1.

The negative Argument from Scripture valid.

The Proposition is sure, the holy Spirit useth a Negative Argument, *Act.* 15. 24. *We gave no such Commandment,* Levit. 10. 1. Jer. 7. 30. *and* 19. 5, 6. *and* 32. 35. 2 Sam. 7. 7. 1 Chron. 15. 13. The Lord Commanded not this, *Ergo,* It is not Lawfull.

Formalists, Answer: Every worship holden to be of Divine necessity, and yet not Commanded by *God,* is unlawfull; but not every worship holden as free, and not binding the Conscience, requireth that *God* Command it.

Ans. 1. Gods Consequence is from the want of a Lawfull efficient and Author; you make him to reason from an Adjunct of the worship: But all worship hath necessity, and Divinity, and a binding power only from the Author God. For why is it Lawfull to *Abraham* to kill or intend to kill his Son? Why is not eating the forbidden fruit Lawfull? Only because *God* Commandeth; and if *God* forbid *Abraham* to kill his Son, and Command *Adam* to eat, it is Lawfull. 2. If this be good, observe all the Ceremoniall Law, so you lay not Divine necessity upon the observance thereof; offer Sacrifices to God under the New Testament, and you cannot fail in the worship against the Institutor: So slaying of the Children to *Molech,* so you count it free and changeable, shall not fail against Gods

(a) *Morton* defense of Cere. gener. q. 1. Sect. 12.
(b) *Burges*, rejoynder, p. 41.
(c) *Gregor. de Valent.* to. 3. dis. 6. q. 2. ref. ad. 2. obj. *Constat quandoquo dici non preceptum id quod adeo non est preceptum, ut sit etiam contra preceptum.*

Gods Commandments of the first Table (*I Command it not.*) They Answer, To kill Children, is Man-slaughter; but I Reply: God doth not, *Ier.* 7. Reason against *Offering the seed to Molech*, as it was murther and forbidden in the sixth Commandment: but as false worship, and forbidden in the second Commandment: Else he proveth not, that it was unlawfull worship against piety, but that it was an act of cruelty: Yea, so it be thought free and bind not the Conscience, it may be Lawfull worship, and is not condemned by this (*God Commanded it not*) Ergo, *It is not Lawfull.*

I Commanded not; (saith (*a*) *Morton*, and (*b*) *D. Burges*,) that is, *I discommanded, or forbade.* *Ans.* So (*c*) saith *the Iesuit Valentia*; but so, Circumcising of women, boyling of the Paschall Lambe, another Ark then *Moses* made, should not be unlawfull, for these are not expressly discommanded. But Gods Commanding to Circumcise the Male-childe, to Roast the Paschall Lambe, to make this Ark: and his silence of Circumcision of women, and boyling the Passeover, and silence of another Ark, is a Command. 2. The Text, *Ier.* 7. Is wronged, *I Commanded not, neither came it in my heart to Command this Abomination:* That is, I never purposed it as worship: else they knew, to kill their Children, except to God, as *Abraham* was Commanded, was unlawfull; as *Isa.* 63. 4. *The day of Vengeance is in mine heart*, 2 *King.* 10. 30. 1 *King.* 8. 18. *Gen.* 27. 41. To be in ones heart, is to purpose a thing. 3. *Valentia* saith, *Exod.* 18. 20. *I Commanded not the false Prophet to speak; But how? By not sending or calling him*: Else God did not say by a Positive Commandment to every false Prophet, Prophecy not; but because God bade him not Prophecy, he was to know God forbade him: Else to speak Arbitrary Doctrines and Propheses, not tying the Conscience, were no false Prophecying.

Not to command, is to forbid

(d) *Morton* gener. defe. c. 1. Sect. 6, 7.
(e) *Burges*, rejoynder, c. 1. Sect. 7. p. 34.

They Object, 1 *King.* 8. 17. *It was well that it was in Davids heart to build a house to God, and yet David had no warrant in Gods Word, for to build an house to God. So Morton* (d) *Burges* (e) *Ans. David* had a twofold will and purpose to build *Gods* house: 1. Conditionall: It was revealed to *David*, that God would have an house built, therefore *David* might conditionally purpose to build it; so it was Gods will he should be the man. This wanteth not *Gods* word: We may desire what ever may promove *Gods* glory conditionally. As that Petition teacheth (*Thy Kingdom come.*) This was recom-

Of *Davids* purpose to build the Temple, how far it was lawfull.

recommended of *God* and approved, 2 *Kin.* 8. 17. 2. A resolute will upon *Nathans mistake, the blinde leading the blinde, this was not Commanded*, though the desire of the end was good, that is, that a house should be built.

Morton, 16. *It was Lawfull upon common equity, considering Gods mercy to him, in subduing his enemies, and that he dwelt in Cedars, whereas God wanted an house, but he could not actually perform it, Without Gods Word: So Burges.*

Ans. 1. The consequence without Gods word, is as good to conclude, that *David* might actually build *Gods house*, as to will and purpose to build it: Because the word is a perfect rule to our thoughts and purposes, no lesse then to our actions; if to build without Gods Word was unlawfull: *Ergo*, to purpose this without Gods Word was unlawfull. A purpose of sin, as of Adultery, is sin, a purpose of will worship, is will-worship and sin. 2. A man of blood is as unfit to purpose to be a type of a peaceable Saviour, as to be a type of a Saviour, 3. If God reprove *Samuels* light for judging according to the eye, 1 *Sam.* 16. 7. Far more he rebuketh his purpose to Anoint a man without his word, *Who giveth Kingdoms to whom he pleaseth*: Yet *Samuel* had a good intention, and Gods word in generall, that one of *Iesse's* Sons should be *King*. 4. If that good purpose had remained with *David* deliberately to build the Lords house, after the Lord had said, *Solomon*, not *David*, must build the house, it would have been sinfull; yet the reasons upon common equity, and a generall warrant that God would have an house, had been as good as before: if *Mortons* consequence be once good, its ever good. 5. By this, without the warrant of the Word, we may purpose to glorifie God: The *Baptist* without Gods warrant, may purpose a New Sacrament, *Caiaphas* may purpose that he shall be the man who shall dye for the people: I may purpose to glorifie God, by a thousand new means of worshipping: *Papists* have good intentions in all they do. 6. A purpose of heart is an inward substantiall worship warranted by Gods Word, *Psal.* 19. 14. *Psal.* 50. 21. *Psal.* 74. 11. *Ier.* 4. 14. *Gen.* 8. 2. *Eccles.* 2, 3. *Isa.* 55. 7. *Ergo*, The word is not a rule in substantiall and Morall Duties; heart-purposes cannot be indifferent heart-ceremonies. 7. *David* needed not aske counsell at Gods mouth and word, for an indifferent heart-purpose, grounded upon sufficient warrant of

common equity, whether he ſhould act it or not; that which warranteth the good purpoſe, warranteth the enacting of the good purpoſe. 8. Who knoweth if God rewardeth additions to the word, with a ſure houſe, and all indifferent Ceremonies?

Arg. 2. Of Additions.

All additions to Gods Word are unlawfull, *Deut.* 4. 2. *Deut.* 12. 32. *Prov.* 30. 6. *Rev.* 22. 18. *Ioh.* 20. 31. *Luk.* 16. 29, 30. 2 *Tim* 3. 17. *Pſalme* 19. 7, 8. So, (a) *Baſilius*, (b) *Hieron*, (d) *Cyprian*, (e) *Chryſoſtome*, (f) *Procopius*, (g) *Turtullian*, All the Fathers, all Proteſtant Divines oppoſing Traditions, put their ſeal and Pen to the plenitude of Scripture: But humane Rites are Additions to Gods word. (h) *Morton* and *Burges* ſay, *God forbiddeth in the foreſaid places, additions of any thing, as Divine and a part of Gods Word, or additions contrary to Gods Word, and corrupting the ſenſe thereof, but not additions perfecting and explaining his Word, as Commentaries and Annotations of the text.*

(a) *Baſil.* in moral. (b) *Hieron.* in *Matth.* 23. (d) *Cyprian* epiſt. 68. (e) *Chryſ.* in 2 *Tim.* 1. (f) *Procopius*, in *Deut.* 12. (g) *Turtullian*, de preſcript adver. heret. (h) *Morton, Burges*, ſupra. c. 2, 3. p. 136.

So do *Papiſts* Anſwer, *Duvallius*, (i) a *Sorboniſt*, *He forbiddeth other new Sacrifices, as of the Gentiles, who offered their Sons and Daughters:* So (k) *Valentia*, (l) *Vaſquez*, (m) *Bellarmine*, (n) *Suarez*, (o) *Cajetan*, *They are not added which the Church addeth, they are from the ſpirit of* God: So (p) *Bannes*; but all theſe do elude, not expound the Texts: 1. Becauſe, if the Iewiſh Princes had Commanded Arbitrary and conditionall Arks, Sacrifices, places of worſhip, ſo they adde not heatheniſh and wicked, as the Gentiles Sacrificing their Children, they had not failed by this anſwer; yet *Moſes* the Prince, is Commanded *to make all according to the Patern in the Mount.* 2. God ſpeaketh to all Iſrael, and not to the Princes only, *Deut.* 4. 1. *Hearken O Iſrael*, he ſpeaketh to theſe who *are bidden to keep their ſoul diligently*, v. 6. 3. It is *Bellarmines* groundleſſe charity, to think private heads who were not Princes and Law-givers, did not take on *an hairy Mantle to deceive, Zach.* 13. 4. And ſay, *Thus ſaith the Lord*, when God *had not ſpoken to them*, Ier. 23. 16. 32. Yea, and Private women added their

(i) *Duvallius*, 2. de legibus, q. 5. art. 1. reſ. ad. 3. *Hoc tantum facito, id eſt, non offeras alia victimarum genera filios aut filias deo, ut Gentiles.* (k) *Valent.* tom. 3. diſp. 6. q. 2. reſp. ad. 2. (l) *Vaſquez*, tom. 2. in 12. deſp. 152. c. 14. *Qui addit novum, non dicitur declinare.* (m) *Bellarm.* de pont. l. 4. c. 17. *Moſes non alloquitur Principes, quorum eſt leges condere (et ſic addere) ſed populum cuius eſt obedire.* (n) *Suarez* de trip. virit. diſp. 5. Sect. 4 *Additiones non corrumpentes ſed perficientes, non ſunt additiones, datæ enim ſunt a Spiritu ſancto.* (o) *Ita* Cajeta. (p) *Bannes*, in 22. q. 1. Art. 10. *Non adduntur verbis dei ipſa dei verba.*

own

own *dreams to the Word of God, Ezech.*13.17,18. 3. They say Traditions are from Gods Spirit: But hath Gods Spirit lost all Majesty, Divinity and power in speaking? If the Popes Decretals, the Councels, the dirty Traditions, wanting life, Language, and power, be from Gods Spirit: *Formalists* admit Traditions from an humane spirit, and in this are shamed even by Papists, who say, God only can adde to his own Word, whereas they say, men, and the worst of men, *Prelates* may adde to *Gods vvord*: 4. But that additions perfecting are forbidden is clear: 1. Additions perfecting, as *Didoclavius* (*p*) saith, argueth the word of imperfection, and that Baptisme is not perfect without Crossing. 2. It is Gods Prerogative to adde Canonick Scripture to the five books of *Moses*, and the *Nevv-Testament*, and the doctrine of the Sacraments which cannot be Syllogistically deduced out of the Old Testament, *Matth.*28.19, 20. *Ioh.*21.31. *Heb.*3.2. *Rev.*1.19. and these are perfecting and explaining additions, therefore men may by as good reason adde Canonick Scripture to the *Revelation*, as adde new Positive Doctrines like this (*The holy Surplice is a sacred signe of Pastorall Holinesse*) (*Crossing is a signe of dedicating the childe to Christs service*) for Papists say, even *Vasquez* (*q*) *That the Pope neither in a generall Counsell, nor out of it, can ordain any nevv points of Faith, vvhich are not contained in the principles or Articles revealed, and may not be evidently concluded out of them.*

All additions, even these which perfecteth the word are unlawfull.

(*p*) Didocl. in alt. Damasc. p. 504,505.

(*q*) Vasqu. to.2.in 1a. disp.154. cap.3. *Respondetur pontificem quidem nec extra generale concilium nec in illo posse Statuere aliquid de fide quod non contineatur in principiis & articulis revelatis aut certissime ex iis colligatur.*

Formalists answer, *It is not lavvfull to adde any thing as a part of divine Worship, but it is Lawfull to adde something as an indifferent Rite, coming from Authority grounded upon common equity*: *And this is the answer of the* Jesuite Vasquez (*r*) *The Pope and Church cannot make an Article of Faith, for that is believed by divine Faith, to come from God only, but as Lawgivers they may give Laws that bindeth the conscience*, and yet are not altogether essentiall in worship. If additions, as divine parts of Gods worship (say we) be forbidden; God then forbidding to adde such Traditions, forbiddeth his own spirit to adde to Gods word, for no man but God can adde additions Divine, that is, coming from God, but God himself, & by good consequence the forbidding men to add additions, as really coming from God, should forbid men to be Gods, for divine additions are essentially additions coming from God; but if he forbid additions only of mens divising, but obtruded to

(*r*) Vasq.ib.

have the like efficacy and power over the conscience, that Canonick Scripture hath, then were it lawfull to adde killing of our children to *Molech*, so it were counted not really to come from *God*, with opinion of divine necessity; and by this, God should not forbid things to be added to his Word, by either private or publick men, but only he should forbid things to be added with such a quality, as that they should by Divine Faith be received as coming from God, and having the heavenly stamp of Canonick Scripture, when as they are come only from the *Pope* and his bastard *Bishops*; so all the fables of the *Evangell of Nicodemus*; The materials of the *Iewish and Turkish* Religion might be received as lawfull additions, so they do not contradict the Scripture, as contrary to what is written, but only beside what is written, and withall, so they be received as from the Church: Also 3. Additions contrary to the word, are diminutions; to adde to the eight Command this addition (*The Church saith it is lawfull to steal*) were no addition to the ten Commandments, but should destroy the eight Commandment, and make nine Commandments only, and the meaning of Gods precept, *Deut.* 12. *Thou shalt neither adde, nor diminish*; should be, *Thou shalt neither diminish, neither shalt thou diminish*: And so our *Masters* make *Moses* to forbid no additions at all: 6. Commentaries and Expositions of the Word, if sound, shall be the word of God it self; the true sense of a speech, is the form and essence of a speech, and so no additions thereunto but explanations, except you make all sound Sermons, Arbitrary Ceremonies and Traditions, whereas Articles of Faith expounded are Sermons, and so the Scripture it self materially taken, is but a Tradition.

Quest. II.

Whether Scripture be such a perfect rule of all our Morall Actions, as that the distinction of essentiall and necessary, and of accidentall and Arbitrary worship cannot stand? And if it forbid all worship not only contrary, but also beside the word of God as false, though it be not reputed as divine and necessary.

Formalists do acknowledge, as *Morton*, *Burges*, *Hooker*, and others teach us, that *Ceremonies which are meer Ceremonies, indifferent in nature and opinion, are not forbidden: yea, that in the generall*

nerall they are commanded upon common equity, and in particular according to their Specification, Surplice, Crossing, Kneeling before consecrated Images, and representations of Christ are not forbidden, and negatively Lawfull, having Gods allowing, if not his commanding Will; but only God forbiddeth such Ceremonies, wherein men place opinion of divine necessity, holinesse and efficacy, in which case they become Doctrinall, and essentiall, and so mens inventions are not Arbitrary and accidentall Worship: But let these considerations be weighed.

1. Distinct. *The Word of God being given to man, as a Morall Agent, is a rule of all his Morall Actions, but not of actions of Art, Sciences, Disciplines, yea, or of meer nature.*

2. Distinct. (Beside the Word) *in actions Morall, and in Gods Worship, is all one with that* (which is contrary to the Word) *and what is not commanded is forbidden, as not seeing in a creature capable of all the five senses is down right blindenesse.*

3. *Lawfulnesse is essentiall to Worship instituted of God, but it is not essentiall to Worship in generall: neither is opinion of sanctity, efficacy, or Divine necessity essentiall to Worship, but only to Divine Worship, and its opinion not actuall nor formall, but fundamentall and materiall.*

4. *Seeing the Apostles were no lesse immediatly inspired of God, then the Prophets, it is a vain thing to seek a knot in a rush, and put a difference betwixt Apostolick Commandments or Traditions and divine Commandments, as it is a vain and Scripturelesse curiosity to difference betwixt the Prophetick all truths of* Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, Ieremiah, Ezekiel, *&c. And Divine Prophecies, which is, as if you would difference betwixt the fair writing of* Titus *the writer, and the writing made by the pen of* Titus, *or betwixt* Peters *words, and the words spoken by* Peters *tongue, mouth and lips, for Prophets and Apostles were both Gods mouth.*

5. *Worship essentiall, and Worship Arbitrary, which Formalists inculcate; or Worship positively lawfull, or negatively lawfull, are to be acknowledged as Worship Lawfull, and Will-Worship, and Worship Lawfull and unlawfull.*

6. *What is warranted by naturall reason, is warranted by Scripture, for the Law of nature is but a part of Scripture.*

7. *Actions are either purely morall, or purely not morall, or mixed of both: The first hath warrant in Scripture, the second none at all, the third requireth not a warrant of Scripture every way concludent, but only in so far as they be Morall.* 8. *Mat-*

8. *Matters of meer fact, knovvn by ſence and humane teſtimonie, are to be conſidered according to their Phyſicall exiſtence if they be done or not done; if* Titus *did ſuch a thing or not, ſuch are not in that notion to be proved by Scripture:* 2. *They may be conſidered according to their eſſence and Morall quality of good and lawfull, bad or unlawfull, and ſo they are to be warranted by Scripture.*

9. *There is a generall vvarrant in Scripture for Worſhip and morall actions, tvvofold: either vvhen the Major propoſition is only in Scripture, and the Aſſumption is the vvill of men, or vvhen both the Propoſition and Aſſumption are warranted by* Scripture: *the former vvarrant I think not ſufficient, and therefore the latter is neceſſary to prove the thing lavvfull.*

Hence our 1. *Concluſion.* Every worſhip, and Poſitive obſervance of Religion, and all Morall actions are to be made good, by καθὼς γέγραπται *(according as it is vvritten)* though their individuall circumſtances be not in the word.

Every Morall Act is to be warranted by the word.

2. The offering, for the *Babe Ieſus, tvvo Turtle Doves, and tvvo Pigeons, are according as it is vvritten in the Lavv,* and yet *Ioſeph* and *Mary*, the Prieſt the Offerer, the day and hour when the male childe Ieſus for whom are not in the Law, *Exod.*13.1. *Numbers* 8. 26. In the ſecond Table *Amaziah* his Fact of mercy in not killing the children for the Fathers ſin is ſaid to be, 2 *Kin.*24.6. performed by the King; ככתוב בספר תורת־משה *As it is vvritten* in the Book of the Law of *Moſes:* yet in that Law, *Deut*,24.6. There is not a word of *Amaziah*, or the children whom he ſpared: becauſe theſe be Phyſicall, and not Morall circumſtances, as concerning the eſſence of the Law of God. Hence in the Categorie of all Lawfull Worſhip and Morall actions: both Propoſition and Aſſumption is made good by this, *As it is vvritten*, even to the loweſt ſpecifice degree of morality as all theſe.

1. The Worſhip of God. 2. Sacramentall worſhip under that. 3. Under that, *participation of the Lords Supper.* 4. Under all, the moſt ſpeciall *participation of the Lords Supper by Iohn, Anna*, in ſuch a Congregation, ſuch a day; All theſe I ſay, both in Propoſition and Aſſumption are proved by καθὼς γέγραπται: And can bid this *(according as it is vvritten)* the like I may inſtance in all other Worſhip, in all acts of Diſcipline, in all Morall acts of juſtice and mercy, in the

ſecond

second Table: But come to the Prelats *Kalendar*, They cry (*Order and decency is Commanded in* Gods *Worship.*) And we hear *Pauls* cry, not theirs; but under this is, 2. (*Orderly and decent Ceremonies of humane institution*;) And here they have lost *Pauls* cry, and the Scriptures (*as it is Written*) 3. Under this (*he Symbolicall signes of Religious Worship instituted by men*) (*according as it is Written*) is to seek. And 4. under all, (Thomas *his Crossing of such an Infant*) is written on the back of the Prelats Bible, or Service book, but no where else: So do *Papists* say, What ever the Church teach, that is Divine truth. Under this cometh in, invocations of Saints, Purgatory, and all other fatherlesse Traditions, which though Papists should teach to be Arbitrary and indifferent; yet would we never allow them room in Gods house, seeing they cannot abide this touchstone, (*according as it is Written.*) 2. Because Scripture condemneth in Gods Worship, what ever is ours, as will-worship. Hence, 2. All worship and new Positive means of worship, devised by men, are unlawfull; but humane Ceremonies, are such, *Ergo,*

Arg. 3. What is mans in worship is not Lawfull.

The Proposition is proved many wayes: as, 1. What is mans in Gods Worship, and came from *Lord-man*, is challenged as false, vain, and unlawfull, because not from God, as Idols, *according to their own understanding*, Hos. 13. 2. *So, from Israel it Was, the Workman made it*, Hos. 8. 6. Hence, (a) *Zanchius*, and (b) *Pareus* infer, *all invented by men, are false and vain*, and so are condemned, *Ier.* 18. 12. *The imaginatisns of their evil heart*, and, Psal. 106. 39. *Their own devises, their ovvn vvorks, their ovvn inventions*, as, *Act.* 7. 41. *Figures vvhich ye made*, Act. 7. 43. Had they been figures of Gods making, as the *Cherubins* and *Oxen* in the Temple, as 1 *King.* 7. They had been Lawfull; dayes *devised by Ieroboams heart*, 1 *King.* 12. 32, 33. *The light of your ovvn fire*, Isa. 50. 11. *A plant that the Heavenly Father planted not*; *Ergo*, By man, *Matth.* 15. 14.

(a) *Zanchius*, Com. in Hos. *Colligimus hinc omnes cultus qui non sunt ex Deo, ex voluntate Dei, ex eius verbo legeque desumpti, sed ex nobis aliisque hominibus excogitati sine Dei verbo damnari.*

(b) *Pareus, Humanum inventum.*

2. The Proposition is proved from the wisdom of Christ, who is no lesse faithfull then *Moses*, who followed his Copy that he saw in the Mount, *Exod.* 40. 19. 21. 23. *Exod.* 25. 40. *Heb.* 8. 5. *Heb.* 3. 1, 2. *Ioh.* 15. 15. Or *Solomon*, 2 *Chron.* 29. 25. 1 *Chron.* 28. 11, 12. *Gal.* 3. 15.

Also, I prove our Conclusion, 3. thus: If the word be a rule to *direct a young mans vvay*, Psal. 119. 9. *A light to the Paths of men*, v. 105.

What is ours in Gods worship, is unlawfull.

Scripture teacheth us us every practicall way.

v. 105. *If the Wisdom of* God *cause us to understand Equity, Judgement, Righteousnesse, and every good vvay*, Prov. 2. 9. *And cause us vvalk safely*, so that our feet stumble not, Prov.3.25. *So that vvhen vve go, our steps shall not be straightned, and vvhen vve run, our feet shall not stumble*, Prov. 4. 11,12. If wisdom lead us as a Lamp, and and a Light, *Prov.* 6. 23. Then all our actions Morall, of first or second Table, all the Worship, and right means of the Worship, must be ruled by this, (*according as it is Written*) else in our actions we walk in darknesse, we fall, stumble, go aside, and are taught some good way, and instructed about the use of some holy Crossing, some Doctrine of Purgatory, and Saint-worship, without the light of the Word: But this latter is absurd: *Ergo*, So is the former.

(c) *Rich. Hooker*, discip. book. 2. p. 55, 56. 58, 59. 8.

It is poor what (*c*) *Hooker* saith against us: *If Wisdom of Scripture teach us every good path*, Prov. 2. 9. *By Scripture onely, and by no other mean, then there is no art and trade, but Sripture should teach: But Wisdom teacheth something by Scripture, something by Spirituall influence, something by Worldy experience*, Thomas *believed Christ vvas risen by sence, because he savv him, not by Scripture, the Ievvs believed by Christs miracles.*

Not all actions in man, but Morall actions onely are regulated by the word.

Ans. 1. Some actions in man are meerly naturall, as to grow; these are not regulated by the word. 2. Some agree to man, as he liveth, as to sleep, eat, drink, and these are considered as animall actions, *Actiones animales*, and do not belong to our Question: But as they are in man, they be two wayes regulated by the word. 1. According to the substance of the act, the Law of nature, and consequently, the word of God Commandeth them: If one should kill himself through totall abstinence from meat and sleep, he should sin against the Law of nature. 2. These actions according as they are to be moderated by reason, are to be performed soberly, and are in Gods word Commanded. (*d*) 3. Some actions agree to man, as he is an Artificiall, or Scientifick agent, as to speak right Latine, to make accurate demonstrations in Geometry, and these are ruled by Art, man in these, as they be such, is not a Morall Agent, but an Artificiall Agent, I say as they are such, because while one speaketh Latine according to the Art of *Disputer* or *Linacer*, he should not lie, and all morality in these actions are to be ruled by *Gods vvord*, and as actions of Art, they are not every good path, or every *good Morall vvay* that *Solomon* speaketh of, *Prov.* 2. 9.

(d) Eccles. 3,4. 2. 4. Luk. 21. 24 1 Thess. 4, 6, 7.

And

and therefore it is a vain Argument against the perfection of Gods word.

2. Hooker saith, *God teacheth us something by spirituall influence Ans.* If without the word, by only influence, spirituall, as he taught the Prophets; it was a vain instance, for influence, visions, inspirations were of old in place of Scripture. If Ceremonies, as Crossing & Surplice come this way from God, they be as nobly born, as the Old and New-Testament: If God teach any thing now by influence spirituall without Scripture. *Hooker* is an *Enthusiast*, and an *Anabaptist*: If experience and sense teach many things now, which Scripture doth not teach, and yet is worship, or a Morall Action, we desire to know these: 3. The instance of *Thomas*, learning that Christ is risen from the dead, by sence and not by Scripture, and of the Iews believing by miracles, and not by Scripture, might make a Iesuit *blush*, for *Christs* Resurrection, and the Doctrine of the Gospel confirmed by Miracles, are not Arbitrary Rites beside *Gods* word, but fundamentals of salvation: Hence the man will have us believe God revealeth Articles of faith to us, by other means then by his word: *Thomas* was helped by his sense, and some Iews to believe Christs Death and Resurrection by miracles: But the formall Object of their Faith, was the Lord speaking in his scriptures.

Helps of faith, and the formall object of faith are different.

2. *Hooker* Objecteth; *When many meats are set before me in the Table, all are indifferent, none unlawfull, if I must be ruled by Scripture, and eat in faith, and not by natures light, and common discretion: I shall sin in eating one meat before another. How many things* (saith (*e*) Sanderson) *do Parents and Masters command their servants and sons? Shall they disobey, while they finde a warrant from Scripture?*

(*e*) *Sanderson* in his Sermon.

Ans. For eating in measure, the Scripture doth regulate us, for eating for Gods glory, the scripture also doth regulate us, and the action of eating according to the substance of the action, is warranted by the Law of nature, which is a part of the word; the meer order in eating is not a Morall action, and so without the lists of the question. If the question be of the order of eating, I think not that a Morall action: 2. Eating of divers meats is a mixt action, and so requireth not a warrant in the Morality every way; if you eat such meats (where there be variety to choose) as you know doth ingender a Stone, or a Cholick, you sin against the sixth Commandment:

3. Masters, Parents, Commanders of Armies may command Apprentices, servants, sons, souldiers, many Artificiall actions, in Trades, in War, where both Commanders and obeyers are artificiall, not morall Agents, and so they touch not the question, but what is morall in all actions of Art, Oeconomy, Sciences, is ruled by the word, except our Masters offend that *Paul* said, *Children should obey their Parents in the Lord*: That men are not both in commanding inferiours, and obeying Superiours vexed with scruples, cometh not from the insufficiency of Gods word, but from this, that mens consciences are all made of stoutnesse. But if this be true, *Seth, Enoch, Noah, Shem, could not eat nor sleep* (saith (*f*) Hooker) *but by revelation which was Scripture to them.*

(*f*) *Hooker* 2 book, Eccles. Pol. p. 60, 61.

Answer, Supernaturall Revelation was to these Fathers the rule of Gods *Worship*, and all their actions supernaturall, and of all their actions morall, in relation to the last end; but for eating and drinking, they being actions naturall, they were to be regulated in these; by naturall reason, and the Law of nature, which was a part then of the Divine Tradition that then ruled the Church, while as yet the word was not written. *Hooker* urgeth thus; *It will follow that* Moses, *the Prophets and Apostles should not have used naturall Arguments, to move people to do their dutie; they should only have used this Argument* (As it is written) *else they taught them other grounds and warrants for their actions then Scripture.* *Ans.* None can deny naturall Arguments to be a part of the word of God, as is clear, *Rom.* 1.19. 1 *Cor.* 15.36,37. 1 *Cor.* 11.14. Yea, Christ, *Mat.* 7.12. teacheth, that this principle of nature (*whatsoever ye would men should do to you, do ye so to them*) *is the Law and the Prophets*, because it is a great part of the *Law and the Prophets*, and therefore they say in effect (*As it written in the Scripture*) when they say (*as it is written in mans heart by nature.*) 2. Principles of nature, are made scripture by the Pen-men of the holy Ghost, and do binde as the Scripture. 3. It will be long ere the Law of nature teach Crossing, and kneeling to bread, to be good Ceremonie.

Naturall reason is a part of Scripture.

Jackson on the Creed, 1. Part.

They Object. I *could not then ride ten miles to solace my self with my friends, except I had warrant from Scripture, and seeing the Scripture is as perfect in acts of the second Table, as in acts of the first; I must have a reason of all the businesse betwixt man and man, of all humane and municipall Laws, but it is certain* (saith Sanderson) *faith,*

Sanderson.

as

as certain as Logick can make it, is not required in these, but onely Ethicall and Conjecturall faith, whereby we know things to be Lawfull Negatively: Its not required that we know them to be Positively conform to Gods Word.

Ans. If you ride ten miles with your friend and do not advise with his word, who sayes (*Redeem the time*) you must give account for idle actions, if *Christ* say, *you must give an account for idle Words.* 2. Though there seem to be more Liberty in actions of the second Table, then of the first; because there be far moe Positive actions, not meerly Morall, which concerneth the second Table, because of Oeconomy, Policy, Municipall and Civill Laws, Arts, Sciences, Contracts amongst men, that are not in the first Table; yet the Morallity of the second Table, is as expresly in Gods Word, as the Worship of the first Table. 1. Because what is justice and mercy, and love toward man in the second Table, doth no more depend upon mans sole will, but upon Gods Morall Law & the Law of nature, then it dependeth upon mans will or human wisdom, how God should be worshipped according to the first Table. For Gods will in his Word, is called by our Divines, a perfect Canon and rule of Faith, and also of Manners: And as the grace of God, *Tit* 2. teacheth us what is *Piety*, so also what is *Righteousnesse* and *Sobriety*. 2. Because as Gods Word condemneth will-worship, which is come of no Nobler blood, then mans will, so condemneth it idle words, and idle actions, which are but *will-works*, and *will-words*, and deeds of *will-justice*, and *will-mercy*: and a *will-conscience* in the second Table, putteth no lesse a rub upon the wisdom of the Lord, the Law-giver, then a will conscience in the first Table. But Formalists say, *If mans Will and authority cannot appoint Crossing, Holy humane-dayes, Surplice, and such, the decent expressions and incitements of Devotion, in the kinde of Arbitrary, Mutable, and Ambulatory Worship; but they must be therein guilty of adding to the Doctrine of Piety and Religion in the first Table: by that same reason they cannot make humane Civill and Positive Laws in War and Peace, to be means of conserving justice and mercy tovvard humane societies in the kinde of duties of Righteousnesse and sobriety tovvards our selves and Neighbours; but they must be guilty of adding to the Doctrine of the second Table.* I Answer: 1. The case is not alike, we cannot be Agents in the performing of any worship to God; nor can we use any

What certitude of Faith is required in all our actions of our daily conversation.

Tit. 2. 11: 12.

The Scripture a warrant for the morality of our acts of the second table, as for the acts of worship.

Many actions of the 2. table are mixt, and not purely Morall, all the actions of the first table are purely merall.

any Religious means for honouring God, which belong to the first Table: But in these we are Morall Agents, doing with speciall reference to conscience, and to true happinesse and the glory of God, as the ends both of the work and workers: and therefore in these we are precisely ruled by the wisdom of God, who hath in his word set down what Worship, and what means of exciting Devotion, and decoring of his Worship pleaseth him, and hath not left men to Lord-will, or Lord-wit; but in many actions that belong to humane societies, we are not Morall Agents, but often Agents by Art, as in Military discipline, Trades usefull for mans life, Oeconomy and Policy in Kingdoms and Cities, in Sciences, as Logick, Physick, Mathematicks, in these *Finis operis*, the end of the work is operation, according to the principles of Arts and Policy, and we are not in them Morall Agents, and so not to be regulated by Gods Word.

The contrary is the clear judgement of Papists, as *Suarez* teacheth us, tom. de virt. et statu Relig. l. 2. de superst. Cap. 1. *Scriptura ipsa præcipit observare vota quæ qua tamen voluntarie non ex precepto promittuntur, et ratio naturalis dictat, non solum esse facienda bona præcepta, sed etiam esse utile, plura bona et honesta facere, quam precepta sunt.---Unde etiam Hæretici ipsi suos peculiares modos et ritus introducunt in modo colendi Deum, qui non sunt in Evangelio vel Divina lege præcepti, imo nec ipsi inter se in hujusmodi ritibus comveniunt, &c.*

For the Scripture giveth not to us, precepts of Grammar, of War, of Trades, and Arts, teaching us to speak right Latine, to make accurat demonstrations: nor is the end of the work here a thing that pitcheth upon that tender and excellentest peece in us, our Conscience, and our Morall duties to God and men, but to make such humane Laws, just and suitable with sobriety and justice, is not left to Lord-will, but right reason, the principles of a naturall Conscience (which are parts to us of Scripture) and the Word of God it self hath determined; whether, *to carry Armour in the night, in such a case? Whether to eat flesh in such a season of the year, when the eating thereof hurteth the Common-Wealth*, and the like, belong to works of justice and mercy, or no? Now it is no marvel that in things belonging to our naturall life, peace, societies, policy, where the end of the work is naturall or civill, and belongeth not, as such, to the Conscience, and Salvation of the soul, that there men be Artificers or Agents according to Art, Oeconomy, Policy, whereas the end of the work, *Finis operis*, in the Worship of God, is Morall, and a matter of an higher nature; and so the means and manner of Worship here, are determined by Gods Word. But when actions

The Iesuit speaketh of the Ceremonies of Lutherans and the Prelaticall faction in *England*.

actions of Arts, Sciences, Trades, Oeconomy, Policy, and Laws positive, are elevated above themselves, *Ad finem operantium*, to *the end that Agents are to look unto*, as they be Morall Agents; Gods Word is as perfect a rule for acts of good manners in the second Table, as in the first: For example, that I speak good Latine, I am to see to *Disputers Precepts*; but that I lie not, and speak not Scandals or Blasphemies, while I speak Latine, there I am to look to Gods Law given by *Moses*. That a Tradesman make works according to Art, he is to advise with Art, but that he sell not his work at too dear a price, he is to advise with the eight Commandment; and when all these acts of Art are referred to Conscience, Salvation, and the glory of God, as they ought to be *Respectu finis operantis*, in respect of the Morall intention of the doer, all their Morallity is squared by Gods Word. Hence there be no actions of Worshipping God, but they be purely Morall, *Et respectu finis operis, Et respectu finis operantis*; but many actions belonging to the second Table, are either purely not Morall, as actions of meer Art, or they be mixed, and *Respectu finis operis*, in respect of the end of the work, they are not Morall, nor to be squared by the Word at all; and in respect of the Morall intention of the doer, they be Morall, and so mixed actions, and partly ruled by the Word, and partly ruled by Art or Policy, according to our seventh distinction.

II. *Conclusion*: In actions or Religious means of Worship, and actions Morall, whatever is beside the Word of God, is against the Word of God; I say in Religious means, for there be means of Worship, or Circumstances Physicall, not Morall, not Religious, as whether the Pulpit be of stone or of timber, the Bell of this or this Mettall, the house of Worship stand thus or thus in Situation.

What is beside the Word of God in Morals, is contrary to the Word of God.

Our *Formalists* will have it in the power of rulers to Command in the matter of Worship, that which is beside the Word of God, and so is negatively Lawfull, though it be not Positively conform to Gods Word, nor Commanded or warranted by practice; which I grant is a witty way of *Romes* devising, to make entry for Religious humane Ceremonies.

But 1. Whatever is not of Faith, and a sure perswasion, that what I do pleaseth God, is sin, *Rom.* 14. 14. 23. And therefore neither can be Commanded by Rulers, nor practiced by inferiours: But things besides Scripture, and negatively Lawfull, are things not

of

of Faith; *Ergo*, The *Assumption* I Prove: 1. I doubt if Lord-will, be the Lord-carver, of what pleaseth God. 2. If it may stand with the wisdom of Christ the Law-giver; for no Ceremonies maketh *Christ* a perfect Law-giver: 3. In things doubtsome, abstinence is the surest side; *Ergo*, Rulers ought not to command them: 4. *Samuel*, *David*, even wicked *Saul* abstained in things doubtsome, while the Oracle of God removed the doubts, and answered him. 5. *Paul* in eating or not eating, which are things most indifferent, requireth a certain perswasion of positive assurance, *Rom.* 14. 14. I *know, and am perswaded by the Lord Iesus, that there is nothing unclean of it self, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, it is unclean.*

(a) *Sanderson* Sermo.

(a) Master *Sanderson* saith, *In things substantiall of Gods Worship, and in things to be done upon necessity of salvation, what is not of Faith; certainly assuring us it is conforme positively to Gods Word, it is sin, so we abhor Popish Additions: But in the actions of our life, as the lifting of a straw, and in Ceremoniall Worship, or accidentals, it holdeth not* (saith (b) *Morton*, and Doctor *Burges*) *not in all particulars* (saith (c) Paybodie) *for there should be no end* (saith (d) Doct. Iackson) *of doubting, for Papists might doubt to assist our King against Roman Catholicks.*

(b) *Morton Burges Supra.*

(c) *Paybod.* par. 2. S. 14. p. 45.

(d) *D. Iackson* on the Creed, l. 3. c. 7. p. 275.

Anſ. 1. Let Formalists explain themselves; Doctrinals, Substantials, and essentiall worship, is such as God hath commanded in the Proposition, and in the Assumption, and particularly in Gods word; Accidentals are such, as he hath commanded in generall, but left particulars to mens will, so they define, like Masters of Arts.

But this our Masters say, in all that Christ hath particularly Commanded, his Testament is perfect, and so I believe, what God hath set down, he hath set down, and so we have *Scripture* right down as perfect as the *Fables of Esop*, & *Nasoes Metamorphosis*: what is in *Esopes* and *Nasoes* books, is in their books, and what they command you, are with certainty of Faith to believe they command, and what the Prophets and Apostles writ, that they writ, and that is essentiall worship; what they writ not, they writ not. 2. Mr. *Sandersons lifting up a straw, is a straw for an instance; actions of imagination are not Morall, We give him leave to rub his beard without Faith, as he weareth white sheets above his garments in Divine service against Faith.* 3. To do in Faith, is to know, that, in that I *serve Christ, and*

The vanity of the perfection of Scripture in essentials, not in accidentals.

am

am accepted of God, Rom.14.2. To do that which condemneth me not, and maketh me happy in the doing thereof, v.21. 3. It is a Faith that I have before God in my conscience, v.22. 4. It is a perswasion by the *Lord Iesus*, that it is clean. 5. It is such, as I know is positively Lawfull by *Scriptures* expresse warrant, 1 *Cor.*10.26. *The earth is the Lords and the fulnesse thereof*; *Ergo*, I have certainty of faith, that it is positively conform to *Scripture* what I do: but in things negatively Lawfull, as lifting a straw, wearing a *Surplice*, I have no perswasion by the *Lord Iesus*, that I serve Christ, and am accepted of God in so doing, and know not from *Psa.*24.1. or from any other scripture, that it is lawfull what I do. 3. A generall warrant is either when the *major Proposition* only is sure by *Scripture*, but you must take the *Assumption* upon the *Formalists Merchant-word*, or where both Proposition and assumption can indure, καθὼς γέγραπται *according as it is written*; this latter wee imbrace with both our hands, but Formalists deny it to us: The first is their meaning. This, what is decent and not contrary to Gods Word, that the Rulers may command: But Surplice, Crossing, &c. are decent and not contrary to Gods Word; *Ergo*. So one *Giles Widdows* (*e*) saith, *Man and Wife are one flesh*: Ergo, *the Ring in Marriage is good*. And, *Fine linnen is the Righteousnesse of the Saints*, Rev.19. Ergo, *a Surplice is good*. And, Matth.16. *Take up your crosse*: Ergo, *the Crossing in Baptisme is lawfull*. Enough of this. But so the worship of the Devil is lawfull: and, *Aarons* golden Calf is lawfull; for I can finde a *major Proposition* for them in Scripture, of which you have a Faith both Negative and Positive; as this, *Whatever God commandeth in his Word, that is lawfull: But God commandeth the* Indians *Devil-worship in his Word*: Ergo, &c. I am not holden to give my Faith for the *Assumption*: Yet it is as good as our Masters reasoning. 4. *Jackson* is wide in his lawfull Negatives, for to fight against Roman Catholicks, at our Kings Command, upon good grounds, is not an indifferent thing, Except to kill men, and shed blood, be indifferent and lawfull Negatively: I thought, to make War, had been amongst the *Substantials*, and Positively conform to *Gods Word*. 5. The Fathers, as *Origen*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Theodoret*, *Anselm* and *Ierome*, upon the place *Rom.*14.23. as *Vasquez* saith (*f*) from this place, *Rom.*14.23. that *What any doth, must be warranted by the light of the conscience as lawfull*:

(*e*) *Giles Widows*, in his lawlesse kneelles Puritan

(*f*) *Vasquez* to.1.12.dis. 59.9.19. Art 6.c.2.

(*g*) *Bannes* to.3.22.q. 1. art.1. *Omne quod non est ex fide, id est, quod fit contra propriam conscientiam est peccatum.*

full. If Formalists stand to this, they must give us some things against conscience, and something beside conscience, that is morally lawfull, and therefore if conscience see not such a thing against Scripture, though it have no warrant in Scripture, yet it is lawfull, and done in a certain perswasion of a well informed conscience; but these who eat things thought to be unclean by Gods Law, to the scandall of others, who knew these meats were not against Piety and *Gods Lavv*, nor yet that the eating of them was against charity, while *Paul* delivered the Doctrine of Scandall, yet their eating was unlawfull. 6. Formalists say nothing here, but what Papists said before them, they say, Men may go to War, doubting of the lawfulnesse thereof; and therefore (*h*) *Vasquez*, (*i*) *Angelus*, (*k*) *Corduba*, and (*l*) *Navarr.* will us, *While the doubt remaineth, to choose the surest side, as conscience ought to do:* And (*m*) *Vasquez* saith, *Manente dubio, &c. To do so long as the doubt remaineth, is to do against the judgement of conscience:* And (*n*) *Adrianus* saith, *While they doubt, and yet go to War, they expose themselves to the danger of Man-slaughter, and by not going to War, they should onely sin by not obeying.* (*o*) *Suarez* saith, *It is a Speculative doubt, vvhen Superiors commandeth it:* And (*p*) *Sylvester* saith, *Such a doubt should be expelled at the commandment of Superiors.* And no marvell the command of Superiors to Papists is an Oracle, and blinde obedience is good meriting; therefore (*q*) *Gratian* and the Iesuit (*r*) *Sanches* saith, Inferiors are not holden to examine the commandments of Superiors.

(*h*) *Vasquez* to. 1. disp. 65. c. 1.
(*i*) *Angelus* verbo Dubium c. 1.
(*k*) *Corduba* l. 3. q. 4.
(*l*) *Navar.* in cap. *de Penitentia* dub. 7. n. 8.
(*m*) *Vasquez* to. 1. disp. 66. cap. 9. *Nec subditus dubius de justitia belli potest parere, quamdiu dubius manet.* (*n*) *Adrianus in quod libet, punct.* 2. *ad* art. 2. *Milites dubii eligerent sic partem dubiam & exponerent se periculo injuste occidendi et prædandi non eundo tantum peccarent non obediendo.* (*o*) Suarez de Tripl. virt. Theol. Tract. 3. disp. 14. Sect. 6. [*p*] Silvester verbo belli. 3. q. 1, c. 4. [*q*] *Gratian.* d. 23. quest. 1. *Quod vulpatur.* [*r*] *Sanches jesuita Cordubensis* in decal. Tom. 2. lib. 6. cap. 3. Num. 3.

5. Iackson saith, *This* (*Whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin*) *holdeth in omission of good, as in commission of evil:* Ergo, *Your not practising indifferent Ceremonies, is not of Faith, and so Sin. Ans.* He that obeyeth doubtingly, is condemned, and he that obeyeth not doubtingly, is condemned; But, Master *Doctor*, your enumeration is not sufficient, and may strike against doubting to worship a Romish Idol, at the command of Superiors; for I shew you a third, and its

What soever is not of faith, &c. how true.

its *Pauls* way, Eat not, obey not, and abstain with perswasion of Faith, that what you do is agreeable Positively to Gods Word.

Jackson saith, *They sin, not by doubting, if the fear of evil after mature deliberation, be not extraordinary, and such as cannot be recompenced by the goodnes which appeareth in the act of Obedience. Doubting is no internall part or essentiall cause of sin, we sin not because we doubt, but because while we doubt, we prefer an evil, or a lesse good, before a good, or a greater good. So their sin was not doubting, but they preferred not eating, which was a bodily losse onely, to the evil feared, which was to be partakers of the Table of Devils, and being Apostates from the Israel of God.* *Ans.* *Paul* expresly saith, doubting is sin, and condemneth it *ver.* 23. and requireth, *ver.* 5. *Let every man be perswaded in his conscience,* v. 21. *Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth,* v. 23. *Whatsoever* (more or lesse in Morall actions) *is not of Faith, is sin:* 2. Internall perswasion, *Rom.* 14. 14. Is an internall cause of obedience, as *v.* 21. And therefore doubting being a sin that condemneth, *Rom.* 14. 23. must be such a sinfull ingredient, as maketh the action sinfull. 3. We both sin, because we doubt, and also because we prefer a lesse good, or an evil to a greater good. 4. No feared evil, though never so evil, whether of sin or punishment if it follow not kindly, but only by accident, and through the corruption of our nature, should or can make us do any thing doubtingly or sinfully, for then *we might do evil, that good might come of it*: No good of obedience can warrant me to sin, and disobey God, nor should that be called obedience, nor is it obedience to men, which is disobedience to God. 5. It is an untruth that non-eating was only a bodily losse, for non-eating Physicall, is a bodily losse, but *Paul* urgeth non-eating morall, to eschew the fall of one *for whom Christ died.* 6. The *Doctor* saith *Ibidem.* *No power under the Heaven could make a Law over the* Romans, *injoyning such meats, because Gods law* (as they conceive) *condemned them.* Now how pleasant are right words? I assume, we conceive God hath denounced all the plagues written in his Book, upon practisers of humane Ceremonies, as upon adders to the word of God, *Rev.* 22. 19. Yea Heresies, to wit, that *Christ* is not the consubstantiall Son of God, may seem probable to us; shall the good of obedience in believing my Pastor, whom God hath set over me, hinder me to obey? 7. Papists say also, that Scripture is

Doubting condemneth.

Papists say the Scripture in generall is perfect, but not in particulars of worship, and so say *Formalists.*

perfect in generall, allowing that Ceremonies should be, when *Paul* saith, *Let all things be done in order and decency*, 1 Cor. 14. *But the Scripture giveth no particular warrant for these, but onely the Churches determination. So* (w) *Scotus*, (x) *Suarez*, (y) *Bellarmine* (z) *Vasquez* (a) *Bannes*, (b) and *Duvallius. The Scripture implicitely, and generally containeth all the substantials necessary for salvation, but not traditions in particular, that is the Churches part, just as* Formalists *say, order and decency is commanded in the Word, but Crossing, Surplice, Humane dayes and such are left to the Prelates Kalender, to fill up what his Lordship thinketh good.* So Hooker (c) *Speech is necessary, but it is not necessary that all speak one kinde of Language, Government is necessary, but the particulars, Surplice, Crossing, &c. Are left to the Church.*

(w) *Scotus*, Prolog. in senten. q.3. ad art.3. *Terminus præfixus* [Theologiæ] *quantum ad revelationem Divinam est totum quæ sunt in sacra Scriptura, sicut habetur* ult. Apocalyps. *Si quis apposuerit ad ista, apponet ei Deus plagas quæ continentur in Scriptura, & quæ possunt elici de ipsis* (x) *Suarez* de tripl. virt. Theolog. Tract. 1. disp. 5. Sect. 4. *Ad perfectionem non est, quod omnia credenda contineat explicite, satis est enim quod contineat mysteria nostræ redemptionis, & substantialia fundamenta Ecclesiæ, cum mediis necessarijs ad salutem.* [y] Bellar. de Effec. Sacrament. cap. 32. respons. ad Arg. 2. *Christus ad plenum nos instruxit* (in Scriptura) *de vero Dei cultu.* Bellar. *Respondet, id verum est de institutione generali, non autem de particulari.* (z) Vasquez Tom. 2. in 1 2. disp. 151. cap. 3. *Nihil novi* (proposiiti) *Statuere possunt, quod non pertineat ad pristinum statum cujusque conservandum----pro libito ferre legem certe non licet.* [a] *Bannes* To. 3. in 22. q. 1. Art. 10. ad. arg. 3. *Scriptura indicat nobis Divini numinis sensum, non tamen in individuo, & in specie sed in communi & generali quadam ratione.* [b] And Duvallius in 2. Thomæ tract. de legib. q. 5. Art. 1. ad Arg. 2. *Scriptura est sufficiens, quia ipsa omnia tam credenda quam agenda implicite continet, & propterea expresse ad Ecclesiam tanquam ad Columnam veritatis, tam in fide, quam in præceptis bene vivendi nos remittit.*

What is only negative in Gods worship, cannot be commanded.

2. What is negatively Lawfull here, cannot be admitted; If Rulers may Command one thing that is negatively Lawfull, they may Command all things; because what they Command under this formall reason, as not against Scripture, they should not adde nor devise new worship, though they Command all of that kinde: But the latter is absurd, for so they might Command in Gods worship. 1. The actions of sole imagination, the lifting of a straw, and all idle actions that cannot edifie. 2. They might Command a new Ark to represent Christ incarnat, as the Jews Ark did represent him to be incarnat, a new Passeover, to represent the Lambe already slain, and all the materials of the Ceremoniall Law

with

with reference to Christ already incarnat, dead, and risen again: For all these are by Formalists Learning negatively *Lawfull*; Shew us a Scripture where they are forbidden, more then Surplice, Crossing, except because they be not Commanded. If it be said, They do not Command things negatively Lawfull, as such, but as they edifie and teach: Well then, 1. As they edifie and teach, they are positively good, and apt to edifie, and so must be proved by the Word as Commanded, and so not negatively Lawfull, and not as beside, but as Commanded in the Word. 2. Yet it will follow, that all these may be used in Faith, that is, out of a sure perswasion that they are not contrary to Gods Word, and so Lawfull. I might dance in a new linnen *Ephod*, before a new Iewish Ark, representing Christ already incarnat, and that in the negative Faith of Mr. *Sanderson*, *Hooker*, and *Jackson*, for this Ark is not against Scripture, yet this Ark is not Commanded, and so not forbidden. 3. Idle actions that have no use or end, might be Lawfully Commanded by this, because they are not forbidden, yet are such unlawfull, *Quia carent justâ necessitate et utilitate*, as *Gregorius* saith: I prove the connexion, because an action Morall, such as (*to Sign With the Crosse*) performed by a Subject of Christs visible Kingdom, for Gods glory and edification of the Church, which yet is neither Commanded nor forbidden by God, nor Commanded by natures light (for none but those that are beside reason will say this) nor light of Gods word, or the habit of Religion, hath no more reason, then the making or forming a Syllogisme in *Barbara*, which of it self cometh only from Art; and as such hath no Morall use, and by as good reason may the Church Command dancing before a new devised Ark; yea, such an action involveth a contradiction, and is Morall, and not Morall: for of its own nature it tendeth to no edification, for then it might be proved by good reason to be edificative, and an action cannot be edificative from the will of men, for Gods will, not mens will, giveth being to things.

4. What is beside Scripture, as a thing not repugnant thereunto, wanteth that by which every thing is essentially Lawfull: *Ergo*, It is not Lawfull. The Consequence is sure, I prove the Antecedent: Gods Commanding will, doth essentially constitute a thing Lawfull, Gods Commanding will only maketh eating and drinking bread and wine in the Lords Supper Lawfull, and the Lords forbidding

will should make it unlawfull; and Gods forbidding to eat of the Fruit of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil, maketh the non-eating obedience, and the eating disobedience. As the killing of *Isaac* by *Abraham*, is Lawfull, and that because God Commandeth it; and the not killing of him, again is Lawfull, when God forbiddeth it. But things negatively Lawfull and beside the word of God, wanteth Gods Commanding will; for God Commandeth not the materials of Jewish Ceremonies to represent Christ already come, and such like: for if he should Command them, they should be according to the word of God, and not beside the word of God: If it be said they have Gods Commanding will, in so far that he doth not forbid any thing not contrary to his own word; but hath given the *Church* Authority to adde to his worship, things not contrary to his word, as they shall see they do promove godlinesse, or may edifie the *Church*: But then if the *Church* must see by the light of reason, and naturall judgement, aptitude in these to promove godlinesse, they are Commanded by God, who hath even stamped in them that aptitude to edifie, and so are not beside Gods word.

4. Our Divines condemne all the Traditions of the *Church* of *Rome*; as *Purgatory*, *Prayer for the dead*, *Imagery*, *Adoring of Reliques*, all the *Crossing*, *Holy water*, *Chrisme*, *Oyl*, *Babies*, *Bells*, *Beads*, *&c.* Because God hath no where Commanded them, and sins veniall and beside the Law, and sins mortall and contrary to the Law, we condemne; because, as what is capable of seeing, and life, and hearing, and yet doth not see, live, nor hear, that in good reason we call blinde, dead, and deaf; all beside the word are capable of Morall goodnesse, and yet not Morally good, because not warranted by Gods word, therefore they must be Morally evil.

Opinion of sanctity & Divine necessity, not essentiall to false worship.

III. *Conclus.* Opinion of Sanctity, holinesse and Divine necessity, is not essentiall to false worship. Formalists will have their Ceremonies innocent and Lawfull, so they be not contrary to the word of God. 2. So they be not instamped with an opinion that they binde the Conscience, and are of *Divine necessity, holinesse and efficacy*; *So* (a) *Morton their Prelat, for opinion of justice, necessity, efficacy and merit*, (saith he) *make them Doctrinals and so unlawfull:* But this is but that which *Papists* say: So *Suarez* (b) saith, That their

(a) *Morton*, Innocency of ceremonies generall defense c.1.S.15.

[b] *Suarez*, de trip. virt. theol. tract. 1. dis. 5. S. 4. *Hæc vero & similia (traditionalia non scripta) non adduntur scripturis ut fiant quasi partes ejus (quod fortasse etiam censeri prohibitum) sed adduntur ut credenda & servanda.*

unwritten

unwritten *Traditions are not added to the Word of God, as parts of the Word of God; but as things to be believed and observed by the Churches Commandment*; and these who did swear by *Jehovah* and *Malcom*, *Zeph.* 1. esteemed *Malcom*, and an oath by *Malcom*, not so Religiously and so holy, as an oath by *Jehovah* and *Malcom*; and yet no doubt, they ascribed some necessity to oaths by *Malcom* and *Jehoram* saying, (*Am I Jehovah to kill and make alive*) who yet worshipped *Ieroboams* Calves, esteemed the worshipping of these Calves lesse necessary, and lesse holy and meritorious, then the worshipping of the true *Iehovah*; yet the Calves called their gods, which brought them out of the Land of *Ægypt*, had some necessity and opinion of holinesse.

For 1. *Aaron* in making a Calf, and Proclaiming a Feast to the Calf, committed false worship; but *Aaron* placed not holinesse, justice, or merit in that worship: Because, *Exod.* 32.22. for fear of the people who in a tumult gathered themselves together against him, he committed that Idolatry; *Ergo*, necessity of Sanctity, Merit, and Divine obligation, is not essentiall to false worship: *Ieroboam* Committed Idolatry in saying, *These are thy Gods O Israel*; but he placed no efficacy or merit therein, because, 1 *King.* 12. 27. He did it, *least the people going to Ierusalem, should return to* Rehoboam, *and kill him*; And the *Philistims* dis-worship in handling the Ark unreverently, had no such opinion, they doubting whither *God* or *Fortune* ruled the *Ark*, 1 *Sam.* 6. 9. It were strange if these who say in their heart, There is no God, *Ezech.* 9. 9. *Psal.* 94. 6. And so fail against inward worship due to God, should think that the denying of God were service and meritorious service to God; and that *Peter* denying Christ, and Iudaizing, *Gal.* 2. 12. for fear, thought and believed he did meritorious service to Christ therein: *Pilate* in condemning Christ; *Iudas* in selling him; the Souldiers in scourging him, did dis-worship to their Creator, the *Lord of glory*: Shall we think that *Pilate*, who for fear of the people did this, believed he was performing necessary, Divine and Meritorious worship to God? 2. If opinion of necessity Divine, of Merit and sanctity, as touching the conscience, were essentiall to false worship; it were impossible for gain and glory, to Commit Idolatry, to preach lies in the Name of the Lord for a handfull of barley, as *Ezek.* 13. 19. *Mic.* 3. 5. 1 *Kin.* 22. 6. 1 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. *Tit.* 1. 11. For its a contradiction to

Preach

Preach *Arrianiſme, Turciſme, Popery*, againſt the light of the minde only for gain; and yet to think that in ſo doing, they be performing meritorious ſervice to God: Yea, they who deviſe will-worſhip, know their own will to be the Lord-carver of that worſhip, at leaſt they may know it; yet ſhall we think they hold themſelves neceſſitated, by a Religious obligation ſo to do? Elſe it were impoſſible, that men could believe the burning their Children were will-worſhip, indifferent and Arbitrary to the worſhippers, which is open war againſt reaſon: Now a worſhip cannot be falſe, wanting that which is eſſentaill to falſe worſhip. 3. Falſe worſhip is falſe worſhip by order of nature, before we have any opinion, either that there is Religious neceſſity in it, or meer indifferency: *Ergo*, Such an opinion is not of the eſſence of falſe worſhip. 4. By that ſame reaſon, opinion of unjuſtice, or opinion of doing juſtice, ſhouldbe of the eſſence of unjuſtice; *Cains* killing of his Brother, ſhould not be Man-ſlaughter, except *Cain* placed ſome divine Sanctity in that wicked fact, which is againſt all reaſon; and the reaſon is alike in both Gods Commanding will and his forbidding will. They Anſwer, Gods will conſtituteth Lawfulneſſe in eſſentiall worſhip, and mans will in things arbitrary; but this is to beg the queſtion, for when we ask what is eſſentiall worſhip, they ſay, it is that which God commandeth, and what is accidental or arbitrary, it is that which human authority commandeth, & this is juſt, Gods wil is the eſſentiall cauſe of that worſhip whereof it is the eſſentiall cauſe, & mans will is the eſſentiall cauſe of that, whereof it is the eſſentiall cauſe. 5. All the materials of *Jewiſh* and *Turkiſh* worſhip, might be appointed for right worſhip, ſo we held them to be Arbitrary. 6. God cannot forbid falſe worſhip, but in that tenure, that he commandeth true worſhip; but whether we eſteem it true, or not, holy, or not; he cōmandeth true worſhip, *Erg.* &c.

The diſtinction of worſhip eſſentiall and accidentall of Gods generall and particular will is to be rejected.

IV. *Concluſion*, It is a vain and unwarrantable diſtinction to divide worſhip in eſſentiall, which hath Gods; 1. Particular approving will to be the Warrant thereof, and worſhip accidentall or Arbitrary, which hath only Gods generall and permiſſive will, and hath mans will for its father; ſo Ceremonies (ſay they) *In theſe, hath Gods generall will, according to their ſpecification, whether a Surplice be decent, or not, is from mans will, therefore they are called Worſhip reductively, becauſe in their particulars, they have no Divine inſtitution, and they tend to the honouring of God, not as Worſhip, but as*

ad-

adjuncts of Worship; so (a) *Morton*; so (b) *Burges*.

Ans. As Sacramentall worship is lawfull essentiall worship, so that this element, bread and wine, and this water is not Arbitrary; *Ergo*, If decency be of divine institution, and Gods approving will, then that *Surplice* or Crossing, or not Surplice and Crossing be decent, is not Arbitrary, and only from Gods permitting will: If the generall must be warranted by the word, so also specials under the generall, else mens will may make a horned Bullock a decent Sacrifice to represent Christ already come in the flesh; for if the written word warrant not the specials of Religious observances, a door is open for all humane inventions. The uniting of these two (*The Crossing of the finger in the Air above a childes face*) and (the dedication of the childe to *Christs* service) are every way like to the uniting, *Of Bread and Wine eaten and drunken, and the souls nourishing by Christ crucified and apprehended by Faith*: If there be oddes, it is in the Authority of the institutors: Our *Formalists* say, the one is essentiall, because ordained by *Christ*, and so bindeth the conscience, and the other Arbitrary, accidentall and of lesse authority: We owe them thanks indeed, the sin is the greater that the Authority is the lesse, but the externall worship is alike. There be oddes betwixt the kissing of a wife by a stranger, and the kissing by her own husband, and oddes betwixt an act of Royall Majesty performed by the King, and that same Act performed by a Traitor faining the same Act, as there be oddes betwixt money stroken by a Tinker, and by the Kings master of Coyne; will this distinction serve the whorish woman, the kisses of a strange man be Arbitrary, indifferent and accidentall: but the kisses of my own husband be essentiall and kindely. And the Tinker might save his head for his false coyne, the Kings money is essentially Legall and currant, but money stroken by me, is Arbitrary and of lesse Authority, then the Kings Lawfull Coyn. 2. If it be necessary and good to honour God by decency and order, the particular goodnesse and holynesse of Surplice and Crossing is also good and holy. But God hath particularly, *Micah* 6.8. *Shewed thee what is good O man*; *Ergo*, he hath also shewed what is particularly holy. But God hath not shewed us in his Word any goodnesse in Crossing, Surplice, because they are of mans devising: If it be said, the particular goodnesse of Surplice and Crossing is good and shewed to us in the generall. I Answer

(a) *Morton* gener. def. cap. 1. S. 22.
(b) *Burges* Treatise of kneeling. cap. 2. p. 2.

swer, goodnesse of indifferent *Rites*, is, *Repugnantia in adjecto*, and a flat contradiction, as who would say, cold fire, indifferent is neither good nor evil, neither Lawfull, nor unlawfull: 2. Then God hath not shewed us all Morall goodnesse in his word, because he hath not shewed to us the goodnesse of Ceremonies. 3. Lawfulnesse is an essentiall property of Divine worship resulting from Gods particular approving will in his word, as is clear, *Hosea* 8.5. 1 *Chro.* 15.13. *Lev.* 10.1. 2 *Sam.* 7.7. *Ier.* 7.30. *Act.* 15.24. *Ergo*, Arbitrary worship must have Gods approving will, commanding it, else it is not Lawfull: I prove the Antecedent from the causes of worship: 1. The end of worship, which is the honouring of God maketh not worship Lawfull; Idolaters may intend to honour God in their Idolatry, as well as true worshippers. 2. The matter of worship is not essentiall to Lawfull worship, for Lawfull and unlawfull worship may have the same common matter, as *Solomons* Calves in the *Temple* were lawfull, because *ordained of God*, and *Samaria's Calves* were unlawfull, because they were from men, the matter of both might be one and the same mettall, *Hosea* 8. 3. The Form of worship in generall, is not the essentiall and specifice Form of Lawfull worship, as the specifice Form of a living creature is not the specifice form of a man, the specifice form of a man is not the specifice form of a just man, as just. Also I may conceive Sacramentall eating in generall, and not conceive whether it be Lawfull or unlawfull: For if Lawfulnesse were the specifice form of worship, I could not conceive worship, but I behooved to conceive Lawfulnesse in it. Now then Gods commanding will, being wanting to Arbitrary worship, it cannot be Lawfull; *Ergo*, unlawfull. If it be answered, Ceremonies are negatively lawfull, not positively lawfull, and the Argument proceedeth of Lawfulnesse positive, which is commanded in the word. But this is, 1. a begging of the question. 2. Negative Lawfulnesse, is from mans will, which should not be a Creatrix of the goodnesse of things or of Lawfulnesse, nor can it Create goodnesse, except you make man to be God: 4. Arbitrary goodnesse and Lawfulnesse hath either a particular warrant and cause of its goodnesse, and Lawfulnesse from Gods expresse Commandment, or 2. From the light of nature, or 3. From the sole will of men, or 4. partly from natures light, partly from mans will, but any of these wayes it can-

not

not be Lawfull. I prove the Antecedent; for it cannot have its warrant from *Gods* generall will, whereby the Proposition of a Syllogisme is warranted, but not the Assumption: for thus the golden *Calfe* of *Ieroboam*; the worshipping of *Satan* should be lawfull: for I can forme a Syllogisme to it from Scripture (*all Worship commanded in the Word is Lawfull*; *but* Ieroboams *golden Calf is Commanded in the Word*; Ergo, *It is Lawfull*. And if both Major, Proposition and Assumption be warranted by the Word, then are Ceremonies essentiall and not Arbitrary worship. If Ceremonies be warranted by the light of nature, this is a part of Gods Word, and *Rom.* 1.19, 20. *God hath shewed it to us*, as, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. We would see natures light to prove that whitenesse of linnen signifieth Pastorall holinesse, rather then whitenesse in the wall, and that the crosse signifieth dedication of a childe to Christs service, rather then lifting up of the childe toward Heaven signifieth the same; and yet Ceremonies must be by this reason essentiall worship; yea, to Sacrifice a sheep to represent Christ already Crucified, is as Lawfull this way as all our Ceremonies. If the third be said, that Ceremonies have their goodnesse and Lawfulnesse from the sole will of men; then Ceremonies are Will-worship: for worship instituted by the sole will of men, without light of Scripture, or nature, is Will-worship. 2. The devisers of them are either Brutish, or void of reason, and the practicers are servants of men, because they serve will, or rather lust of men, without any reason Commanding. 3. If Ceremonies come partly from mens will, partly from the light of reason; then do they conclude the Lawfulnesse of Ceremonies either fallibly or necessarily: If the former be said, we have little warrant of conscience to practice them; nor can God be honoured, nor these things Lawfull, good, and edificative, more then unlawfull, evil and unapt to edifie, seeing there be no light of Scripture, or nature to make them good to us; and becaus a fallible and unnecessary consequence, is ever fallible and unnecessary, and standeth (as *Aristotle* saith well) in an indivisible point. It is a non-consequence, and so mens will is the best house that Ceremonies are descended of. If they can be proved by a necessary and infallible consequence, we desire to hear it, for it must be thus or the like: *Things not contrary to the Word, and commanded as apt to edifie, may be Lawfull Arbitrary Worship*: But

Ceremonies are such; *Ergo*, the Proposition is not true, because Rulers judge either such things apt to edifie, because they see them to be so in themselves, or because they judge them to be so in themselves, therefore they are so in themselves: the former cannot be said, because this light whereby Rulers see Ceremonies to be apt to edifie, is either light of Scripture, or nature, or both: If this be said, they can make others see this light. Also, if there be goodnesse and aptitude to edifie souls in Ceremonies by natures light, sound reason, or the Word of God, they cannot be Arbitrary or indifferent worship: but must be essentiall worship, having warrant and Commandment from God; for what natures light, or Scripture Commandeth, that God himself Commandeth, and what God Commandeth is essentiall, not Arbitrary worship. 2. And secondly, they are not Arbitrary things, but necessary and Lawfull by natures light, by Scripture, or both, which they deny; if the latter be true, then is the will of Rulers, that which maketh Ceremonies good and Lawfull; a vain and blasphemous assertion, for Pope or Prince, or mens pleasure finde pre-existent goodnesse and Lawfulnesse in things, and they do not make them good: It is proper to God alone, who calleth things that are not, to create both beings and goodnesse of beings. 5. If Arbitrary goodnesse and Lawfulnesse of Ceremonies be thus warrantable, because not contrary to the word, and esteemed Arbitrary; I might fail against the first four Commandments, by superstition and idolary: so I esteem these, to wit, Idolatry and superstition Arbitrary, and not of Divine necessity, and yet in so doing, I should neither sin, nor commit acts of false worship; because superstition and Idolatry are indeed forbidden, but superstition and Idolatry, with the opinion, that they have neither holinesse, merit, nor Divine necessity, but are meerly Arbitrary, are no where forbidden in the word. Let Formalists by their grounds, shew us a Scripture for it; for they cannot by their Doctrine be forbidden as false worship, seeing they want that which essentially constituteth false worship (as they teach) for they (as the Argument supposeth) want opinion of necessity, Divine merit and holinesse. 6. If the *Churches* will, commanding Crossing, and Surplice, make them Lawfull; then their forbidding them shall make them unlawfull, and mans will shall be a Pope and God. 7. If Rulers conclude them Lawfull, then either upon Nationall

reasons

reasons concerning *Britain* rather then other Nations, or upon reasons immutable & eternal: if the latter be said, they be essential worship, not Arbitrary; if the former be said, they be more apt to stir up the dull senses of Brittish men, then others, which is a dream. Dull senses are alike every where, sin originall alike in all places, and God in his perfect word hath provided alike remedies against naturall dulnesse to all mankinde, else we in *Britaine* do supererogate, and the word must be perfect to some Nations, in that which is common to all, and not to others. 8. By as good reason, Arbitrary mercy, and Arbitrary justice is holden as Arbitrary worship; for the Lords word is as perfect in works of charity for the second Table, as in works of Religion for the first, and if so be, then it were in mens will to do things conducing for the murthering, or not murthering of our brethren, of their own wit and will, without the word of God, and there should be some lawfull acts of will-love, or will-murther. 9. Laws oblige (as Papists grant) as (a) *Driedo*, and (b) *Vasquez* say, after *Gerson*, *Occam*, *Almain*, and other Papists, *from the goodnesse of the matter commanded in the Law, not from the Will of the Law-giver:* If then the generall will and command of God constitute Arbitrary worship, this worship from Gods will layeth a band on the conscience, no lesse then essentiall worship: For *Hezechiah* is no lesse obliged in conscience to apply Figs to his boyle, and *Moses* to make every little ring in the Tabernacle: when *God* commandeth these, then the Prophets are to write Canonick Scripture: for Gods Authority in Commanding, is equall in all, though in respect of the matter, there be great things, and lesse things of the Law: therefore *Gods* generall permissive will, doth no lesse oblige the conscience, then his approving will. 10. To this Arbitrary worship agreeth all the properties of will-worship; as 1 *Colos.*2.18. *It beguileth us of our reward*; for no promise of God is made of a Bishoprick for conformity: 2. It is will-humility, to be devouter then God willeth us. 3. *It intrudeth in things not known in the Word.* 4. *It holdeth not the head Christ*, for it maketh him not a perfect Law-giver, if Prelates under him give Laws added to his word, and that after the Traditions of men. 5. It inthralleth men dead with Christ, to a yoak. They object, *But not to yoak upon the conscience. Answer*; yea, but we are in Christ freed also from the externall yoak, as from shedding of blood in Circumci-

(a) *Driedo de Libert Christ.* l.3. c.3. ad arg. 3. *Non est in potestate legislatoris prout voluerit obligare ad mortale & veniale sed hoc provient ex materiæ gravitate.*

(b) *Vasquez* Tom.2. in 1.2. disput. 154. c.3. *Neque enim in voluntate legislatoris est obligare vel non obligare.*

 sion

sion, removall out of the Campe seven dayes, many Ceremoniall Sabbaths, presenting of the male-children, *and going up to sacrifice at Jerusalem*; yea, expensive offerings, all called burdens, *Act.*15. 10. *Col.*2.20. *Gal.*4.3,4,5. *Col.*2.14.15. *And multiplied holy dayes, Surplice, Crossing, keeping us in that same bondage*; though lesse (they may say) *Magis, & minus non variant Speciem. 6. This Worship perisheth with the use: 7. Subjecteth us to the Ordinances of men.* 8. *Hath a shew of wisdom,* Mr. Burges (a) saith, *Some Will-worship is not unlawfull, as three Sermons in one day. The free-will-offerings and vows were in some sort will-Worship. The Church at her godly discretion; and will, may appoint some Formalities to attend the Worship.* Answer, *Gregor. de valent* saith, *That some Idolatry is Lawfull, some unlawfull*: This man saith, some will-worship is lawfull, some unlawfull, that is, some sin is Lawfull, some unlawfull: 2. Three preachings come from zeal, not from will, and is no new worship different from preaching, and there may be reason therefore, where all cannot be present in one day at all the three, there is reason for three preachings, none for Crossing: 3. Will as will, is carver of will-worship: Will createth not the worship, but determineth the circumstances according to the light of reason, in Lawfull worship. But where will, as will, void of reason hath influence in the worship, it is wills brood: 4. The Freewill offerings were determined by God, the poor should offer a pair of Doves, in the Free-will offering: But the rich a Lamb, and it was sin for the rich to offer a pair of doves, and therefore will was not determinatrix in this. 5. The man jumbleth together godly discretion and will: they be much different; but for godlinesse in short sleeves, and Crossing a finger in the Aire, I understand it not, nor can reason dream of any warrant for it, but will, as will, that is, mans lust made it.

[a] *Burges* rejoynd c.2.S.7.p. 179.

Neither do Formalists go far from (a) *Suarez*, and (b) *Bellarmine*, who call that will-worship, which is *devised only by a mans wit, and is not conforme to the principles of Faith, and wanteth all reason, and the received use of the Church.*

(a) *Suarez* de relig.to. 2.de honest voti lib. 1. c.1.n.8.9.

(b) *Bellar.* de effic. Sacram.l.2. c.32. ad arg.2.

But we are disputing here against the *Churches* use, as if it were not yet a received use. But upon these grounds I go: 1. Reason not binding and strongly concluding, is no reason, but meer will. So Ceremonies have no reason: If the reason binde, they are essentiall worship: 2. Authority is only ministeriall in ordering *Gods* worship

ship, and hath no place to invent new worship. 3. Authority as Authority especially humane, giveth no light, nor no warrant of conscience to obey, and therefore authority naked and void of scriptures-light is here bastard authority. 11. In all this Formalists but give the *Papists* distinction of Divine and Apostolick Traditions: for power of inventing Ceremonies to them is Apostolick, but not infallible and Divine: (c) *Suarez* giveth the difference: *God* saith he, *Is the Immediate Author of Divine Traditions, and the Apostles only publishers: But the Apostles are immediate Authors of Apostolick Traditions, God in speciall manner guiding their will.* So (d) *Cajetan* (e) *Sotus* (f) *Bellar.* So our *Formalists* (g) *Duname* (h) *Hooker* (i) *Sutluvius*; But I like better what (k) *Cyprian* saith, *That no Tradition, but what is in the Word of God, is to be received*: But this distinction is blasphemous, and contrary to Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 14.37. *The things that I write unto you*: (even of decency and order, as v. 29.40.) *Are the Commandment of the Lord*, 2 Pet. 3.2. *Peter willeth them to be mindefull of the words* which were spoken before, *by the holy Prophets, and of the Commandments of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour*: Then the Apostles Commandments are equall with the Commandments of the Prophets. But in the Old Testament, there were not some Traditions Divine, and some not every way Divine, but Prophetical, for the Prophets were the *mouth of God*, as is clear, 2 *Pet.* 1.19,20,21. *Luk.* 1.70. *Rom.* 1.2. So 1 *Tim.* 6.13. *I give thee charge in the sight of God*---14. *That thou keep this Commandment without spot, unrebukable, untill the appearing of the Lord Iesus.* Now the Commandment (as *Beza* (l) noteth) *Are all that he writ of discipline, which Formalists say, are for the most Apostolicke, but not Divine Traditions.* 2. If Ceremonies *seem good to the holy Ghost*, as they say they do from *Act.* 15. then they *must seeme good to the Father and the Son*, as the Canon is *Act.* 15. But that Canon was proved from expresse Scripture, as *Peter* proveth, v. 7,8,9. and *James* v. 13,14,15,16. If they come from the Spirit, inspiring the Apostles, they cannot erre in such Traditions; If from the spirit guided by the holy Ghost, they come from Scripture. 3. If these traditions come from no spirit led by light of Scripture, we shall not know, whether they be Lawfull, or not, for the Scripture is a Canonick rule of lawfull and unlawfull. 4. If any Apostolick spirit be given to Authors of Ceremonies, why not also in

[c] *Suarez* de tripl. virtut. tract. 1. dis. 5. Sect. 4.
[d] *Cajetan* opusc. to. 1. tract. 27.
[e] *Sotus* de justific. l. 7 c. 6. ar. 1
[f] *Bellar.* *de verbo non Scripto.*
[g] *Douna.* l. 3. c. 36.
[h] 3 Book p. 153.
(i) *Sutluvius*, de Presbyt. c. 11. p. 67.
(k) *Cyprian* epist. 74. *Vnde ista traditio? &c. si in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis, aut actibus continetur, & observetur Divina et sanctahæc traditio.* The distinction of divine and of Apostolick Traditions rejected.
(l) *Beza* an in loc.

in preaching and praying? How then do many of them turn *Arminians, Papists, Socinians*? 5. The Apostolick spirit leading institutors of Ceremonies, doth either infuse light naturall, supernaturall, or Scripturall in devising Ceremonies, and so *Eatenus*, in so far they were essential worship, or the Apostolick spirit doth lead them, with no light at all, which is brutish *Enthusiasme*: or 3. Gods Apostolick spirit infuseth the generall equity, and negative Lawfulnesse of these truths (*Surplice is an Apostolicall signe of Pastorall holinesse*) and (*Crossing a signe of Dedication of a childe to Christs service*) Now light, for this we would exceedingly have. If this light be immediatly infused, then Surplice, Crossing are as Divine, as if God spake them; for truths immediatly inspired lost no divinity, because they come through sinfull men; for *Balaam* his Propheſie of the star of *Jacob*, was as Divine, in regard of Authority, as if God had spoken it, but if these trash come from an inferiour spirit, we desire to know what spirit speaketh without the word. But some may object; The preaching of the word is somewhat humane, because its not from the infallible spirit that dited the word; *Ergo*, Ceremonies may come from the holy Spirit, though they be not as lawfull as Scripture. *Anſ.* Let them be proved to be from the warrant, that the word is preached, and we yeeld to all. 5. Apostolick Ceremonies, but not Divine have *Gods* generall allowing will for the accepting of them. Now *Sampsons* mother, *Judg.* 13.23. proveth well, *The Lord hath accepted our offering*; *Ergo*, it is Lawfull, *and he will not kill us*. So *God atcepted* Abel, *and* Noah *their Sacrifices*; *Ergo*, they were Lawfull, and Divine worship. So *Hosea* 8.8. *They sacrifice flesh for the sacrifices of my offerings, and they eat it, but the Lord accepteth them not. Ergo*, offerings of flesh without offering of themselves as living sacrifices to God are now unlawfull: If God accept of Ceremonies, they must be Divine service, if he accept them not, they must be unlawfull. They *Answer, He accepteth them as Arbitrary worship, not as essentiall*: I Answer, God might have accepted so *Sampsons* sacrifice, and *Noahs*, as arbitrary worship, and yet not be gracious to them, nor reward their sacrificing, as good service, contrary to the Texts alledged; but I doubt much, if the Lord be gracious to men, and accept in Christ corner Caps, Surplice, Crosing, humane holy dayes.

They object, *Our Circumstances of time, place, persons, &c. are*

no

no more warranted by the Scripture, then Ceremonies are. And God might in his Wisdom (saith (a) *Burges*) *have calculated the order of times and places, such climats and seasons; but he hath left these, as he hath left our Ceremonies to the Churches liberty.*

(a) *Burges* rejoynder, cap. 1. Sect. 16. p. 90.

Ans. *Time and place* (as I observed already) being circumstances Physicall, not Morall, nor having any Religious influence to make the worship new and different in nature, from that which is commanded in the Law, though they be not expresly in the Word, do not hinder, but you may say, Such an act of worship is *according as it is Written:* for as Praying, Preaching, hearing, is *according as it is Written:* so is Praying and Preaching in this convenient place, proved by that same Scripture (*As it is Written*) but one and the same Scripture doth not warrant Order and Surplice. 2. The question is not, what Gods wisdom can do, for he could set down all the names of Preaching *Pastors, Doctors, Deacons*, Elders in the Word; but his wisdom thus should have made ten Bibles more then there be: But all our Ceremonies might have been Comprehended in one Chapter of the *Revelation*, if God had thought good to Honour them with inserting them in the Canon. 3. He hath determined these by natures light, and prudence, which dwelleth with that light, revealed in the Word; That a Bishop be thus qualified, as 1 *Tim.* 3. is Morall and determined; but that they call him *John, Thomas*, and be of such Parents, Country, stature of body, is Physicall and in Christs wisdom, is not determined, nor could it be conveniently. Lastly, that generall permissive will of God, is good, for all the Ceremonies of Rome, taught by Papists; As for ours, as *Suarez* de Triplic. virt. tract. 1. disp. 2. Sect. 6. n. 3. *Dicendum fidem quoad substantiam credibilium semper fuisse eandem a principio generis humani.* And so saith *Alensis*, 3. p. q. 69. *Lombard.* 3. dist. 25. and *Durandus*, 3. dist. 25. *Bonaventura*, 16. Art. 2. q. 1. *Hugo de sancto victore de sacram*, l. 1. part. 10. cap. 4. This they have from the Fathers, *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, contr. prop. voc. nov. cap. 37. *Ireneus*, contr. hereticos, lib. 3. cap. 2. *Hyerom* in *Psal.* 86. *Aug.* de civitate Dei lib. 11. cap. 3. lib. 14. cap. 7. *Chrysost.* de Lazero homil. 4. *Cyprianus* sermone de Baptismo. *Optatus Milevitanus*, contr. parmeni. de cælo, l. 5. And I might cite many others, who all affirm, *All truth Divine is in Scripture, all not in Scripture is to be rejected:* So *Suarez*, de leg. tom. 4. cap. 1.

Circumstances not positive religious observances as Ceremonies are.

Hæc

Hæc enim præcepta Ecclesiastica pro universali Ecclesia tantum sunt quatuor, aut quinq; quæ solum sunt determinationes quædam juris Divini moraliter necessaria homini.----Reliqua omnia vel pertinent ad particulares status qui voluntariè suscipiuntur, vel ad ordinem judicialem. Et idem contra sectæ Anglicanæ Erro. lib. 2. cap. 16. *Dicimus authoritatem Dei* (in benedictione Campanarum) *non de esse, saltem in radice & origine, quia ipse dedit authoritatem Pastoribus Ecclesiæ ad regendam Ecclesiam, & disponenda, eaquæ ad accidentarios ritus Ecclesiæ pertinent.* Bannes, tom. 3. in 22. q. 10. dub. 2. *Notandum quod neq; Pontifex, neq; tota Ecclesia possunt novum articulum, novum dogma quoad substantiam, aut novum Sacramentum instituere.* Andr. Duvallius, in 2. de legib. q. 4. Art. 2. *Ceremoniæ & judicialia in vetere lege erant juris Divini, in Nova lege sunt juris tantum Ecclesiastici:* And *Valdensis de Doctrina fidei*, l. 2. cap. 22. *Ecclesia non potest Novum articulum proponere:* So *Alphas. à Castro in summa*, lib. 1. cap. 8. And *Canus*, loc. lib. 2. cap. 7. *Cameracensis*, 2. sentent. q. 1. Art. 1. *Principia Theologiæ sunt ipsæ sacri Canonis veritates, quoniam ad ipsa fit ultima resolutio Theologici discursus, & ex iis primo singulæ propositiones Theologiæ deducuntur.*

V. *Concluf.* Matters of fact are not, and need not be proved by Scripture: 1. Because sense maketh them known to us. 2. Their Morality is sufficiently known from Gods Word. 3. In matters of fact there may be invincible ignorance: Christs Resurrection is not a matter of fact, as (a) *Hugo Grotius* saith, but also a matter of Law, as all the miracles and Histories in the Word, and to be believed, because God hath so spoken in the Word.

[a] *Hugo Grotius* de jure belli, l. c. 20. n. 48.

QUEST. III.

Whether Ceremonies have any Divinity in them?

Arg. 4. Against humane Ceremonies, because they usurp the essential properties of Divine ordinances.

ALL means of worship devised by men pretending holinesse, by teaching, exciting our dull affections to Devotion, as if they were powerfull means of grace, and did lay a band on the conscience, when as yet they be no such thing, and want all warrant from God, and are contrary to devotion, are unlawfull.

But humane Ceremonies be such: *Ergo*,

The Proposition is certain: I prove the Assumption by parts: 1. Whatever holinesse be pretended to be in Ceremonies; yet God onely

onely sanctifieth people, offices in his house, as the sons of *Aaron*, Altars, Temples, Vestures, Sacrifices by his expresse iustitution, as we are taught, (*b*) yet are Ceremonies holy; their Author be the Apostles successours. 2. Their end to honour God. 3. Their matter is not civill or naturall. 4. Their signification mysticall, is Religious. 2. They be means of *teaching and stirring up the dull affections to the remembrance of duties, by some notable and speciall signification, whereby the beholders may be edified*; and since *to stir up the minde*, as a memorative object be the word of Gods due property, or the works of Providence and Creation; would not a Prelat in his Epistle to his under-Pastors, speak *Peter-like*, as, 2 *Pet.* 1. 13. *I think it meet, so long as I am in this Tabernacle, to stir up your dull mindes, by way of remembrance to your Christian duty, by Crossing, kneeling to Gods board and Altar, and Surplice*; To be memorials were due to Phylacteries Commanded in the Law, to minde heavenly duties, *Numb.* 15. 38,39. *Deut.* 22. 12. And the *twelve stones* set up by Gods speciall Commandment, *Iosh.* 4. 2,3. to be a memoriall of their miraculous entry into the holy Land, and *Manna* Commanded to be kept in the Ark, as a sign of Gods feeding his people with *Christ the bread of life*, *Ioh.* 6. 48, 49. 51. are Ordinances of God, to call to remembrance duties and speciall mercies: And *Sacraments* do signifie as tokens ordained of God, *Gen.* 17. 11. *Gen.* 9. 13. *Heb.* 9. 8. *The Holy Ghost thus signifying, that the way to the holiest, was not yet made manifest*: So *Heb.* 8. 5. *Heb.* 10. 1. And so must it be here said. *The holy Prelats thus signifying, that Crossing should betoken the childes dedication to Christs service*: So (c) *Hooker*: *Actions leave a more deep and strong impression then the word.* What blasphemy? that Crossing and Surplice leave a deeper impression in the soul, then *Gods Word, the power of God to salvation*, Rom. 1. 16. *And mighty through God to cast down strong holds in the soul*, 2 Cor. 10. 4? I wonder if *Crossing Capping, kneeling* to stocks, can *bring every thought Captive to the Obedience of Christ.* 3. It is essentiall to the word to teach, and *make wise the simple*, Psal. 19. 7. Psal. 119. 99. Prov. 6. 23. And Ceremonies are made Symbolicall and Religious teaching signes, yet is the stock called *a Doctrine of lies*, *Jer.* 10. 8. *Habac.* 2. 18. Though it teach and represent the same *Iehovah* that the Word teacheth, *Isa.* 40. 18. So it is not a living teacher, because it representeth a false god, or not the true

[b] *Levit.* 20. 8. *Exod.* 20. 11. 16, 17. *Exod.* 29. 29. 33. 36, 37. *Exod.* 40. 9. cap. 2. 10. cap. 26. 1, 2, 3. cap. 27. 1, 2.

(c) *Hooker*, Book 3. p. 129.

God: for the true *Iehovah* saith, *To whom will ye liken me?* But now the stock by mans institution took on it, without a warrant from God, to represent God. Now if God had warranted the stock to be an image representing God, as he warranteth the *Temple, the Ark, Bread and Wine, to be images and representations of the true God Iesus Christ*, the stock should be a Doctrine of truth, and not of lies; so Surplice is a Doctrine of lies, not because what it teacheth is a lie, for what it teacheth is Scripture, *Isa.* 52.11. That *these who beareth the Vessels of the Lord*, (that is Pastors) *should be holy*: but it is a Doctrine of lies, because it representeth Pastorall holinesse by humane institution, without all warrant of the Word of God. And when *Paul* calleth holidayes *Elements*, *Gal.* 4. 6. He meaneth that they spell to us, and teach us some truth, as (a) *Estius* saith, That *holidayes do teach us Articles of Faith*: To which meaning, (b) *Paludanus*, (c) *Cajetan*, (d) *Vasquez* say, *God may well be painted in such expressions, as Scripture putteth on God, as in the likenesse of a Dove, as a man With hands, eyes, ears, feet, all which are given to God in Scripture.* 4. It is essentiall to the Word to set down the means of Gods worship, which is the very scope of the second Commandment; and therefore the Iews washings and Traditions are condemned, because they be Doctrines of men, appointed by men to be means of the fear or worship of God, as *Math.* 15. 9. *Mar.* 7. 8. *Isa.* 29. 13. Hence we owe subjection of Conscience to Ceremonies, as to lawfull means of Worship. 1. *Stirring up our dull senses*: And 2. as lawfull signes representing in a Sacramentall signification, holy things: 3. As teaching signes: 4. As means of Gods fear and worship: Whereas God (as (e) *Ainsworth* observeth well) in the second Commandment forbiddeth *all images and representations*: 2. *All shapes*, Exod. 20. 4. *Temniah*. 3. *Forms of figures*, *Tabuith*, Deut. 4. 16. 5. *Any type or shadow*, *Tselem*, Ezek. 7. 20. 16,17. 6. *Any pictured shape*, *Maskith*, Levit. 26. 1. *Any Statue, Monument, Pillar, Matteseba*h, *any Graven, or Molten Portraict*, Hos. 13. 2.

(a) *Estius*, l. 3. dist. 37. S. 14.
(b) *Palud.* m.3.d.9.q. 1. art. 2.
(c) *Cajet.* in 3.q.25. art. 3.
(d) *Vasquez* to.3.de Ado.disp. 103.c.4.
(e) *Ainsworth*, commu. of Saints.

5. We are obliged to obey the Word, *Exod.* 20.7. *Prov.* 3. 20, 21. *Prov.* 8. 13. *Ier.* 6. 16. *Ier.* 5. 7. 2. We owe to the Word belief, *Luk.* 1. 20. Love, *Psal.* 119. 49. 81. Hope: 3. And are to expect a reward therefore, *Psal.* 19. 11. *Rev.* 2. 7. 10. 27, 28. *Gal.* 4. 11. *Rom.* 6. 23. *Coloss.* 2. 18. *Hebrew.* 11. 25. *Psal.* 34. 9. *Psal.* 58.

Psalme 58. 11. Then if Decency be commanded, and order, in the third Commandment, *Ergo*, this, and that orderly mean of Worship, as *Surplice*; But can we say, *I hope in the Surplice? O how love I crossing and Capping? can we believe in Ceremonies*, as means of Gods worship? 6. The word is Gods mean to work supernaturall effects, *to convert the soul*, Psal. 19. 7. *To work Faith*, *John* 20. 3. To edifie, *Act.* 20. 32. *To save*, Rom. 1. 16. The obedience to *Gods* word, *bringeth Peace*, Psal. 119. 165. *Comfort*, v. 50. *Gen.* 49. 18. *Isa.* 38. 3. But Ceremonies, being apt to stir up the dull minde, must be apt to remove Naturall dulnesse, which is a supernaturall effect, and so to bring, *Peace, joy, comfort:* Organs are now holden by the same right, that they were in *Moses-Law*, then they must stir up supernaturall joy: There must be peace and comfort in practising them: Hear how this soundeth, *This is my comfort, O Lord, in my affliction, that thy Surplice, Organs, and holy-dayes have quickened my dull heart.* Now what comfort, except comfort in the Scriptures? *Rom.* 15. 4. Ceremonies be innocent of all Scriptures.

What joy (a proper fruit of the Kingdom of heaven, *Rom.* 14. 17.) can be in saplesse Ceremonies? yea, observe, 1. Who truly converted from Popery, who inwardly humbled in soul, doth not abhor Ceremonies, by the instinct of the new birth? 2. What slave of hell and prophane person call not for Ceremonies? 3. Who hath peace in dying, that Ceremonies were their joy? 7. All Lawfull Ordinances may by prayer be recommended to God for a blessed successe as all the means of salvation, *Psal.* 119. 18. *Matth.* 26. 26. *Act.* 4. 29, 30. 2. We may thank God for a blessed successe, which they have by the working of the spirit of Grace, 2 *Cor.* 2. 24. 1 *Cor.* 1. 4, 5. 2 *Thes.* 1. 2, 3. *Ephes.* 1. 3. 3. We are to have heat of zeal against prophaning of word, Sacraments, Prayer, or other Ordinances of *God*: But what faith in praying, *Lord Work With Crossing, Capping, Surplice?* For where the word is not, nor any promise, there be no Faith, *Rom.* 10. 14. What praising can there be for Ceremonies working upon the soul? What zeal (except void of knowledge and light of the word, and so but wilde-fire? *Gal.* 4. 17, 18. *Phil.* 3. 6. 2 *Sam.* 21. 2.) can there be, though the Surplice be imployed to cleanse Cups, and Crossing be scorned? If the subject be nothing, the accidents be lesse; if Surplice be not commanded, nor forbidden, the reverent or irreverent usage thereof, cannot be forbidden, nor

commanded, true zeal is incensed only at sin, and kindled toward *Gods* warranted service. 8. I take it to be Gods appointment, that the Spirit worketh by a supernaturall operation, with his own Ordinances, in the regenerated, but we desire to know how the Spirit worketh with Ceremonies: *Formalists* are forced by these grounds to maintain the Lawfulnesse of Images: So 1. They be not adored: 2. If they be reputed as indifferent memorative Objects, and books to help the memory. But 1. It shall be proved that at first, Papists did give no adoration to Images, nor doth *Durandus*, *Hulcot*, *Pic. Mirandula* acknowledge any adoration due to them, but proper to God, before the Images as objects. 2. We may liken *God* and *Christ* to a stock, to we count it indifferent, to make, or not to make such an image, yet likening him to any thing is forbidden, *Isa.* 40. 18. Also we esteem it Idolatry interpretative, to take Gods place in his word, and to make any thing to be a mean of grace, except Gods own Ordinances: Against all these *Formalists* have diverse exceptions.

As 1. *Our Ceremonies* (say they) *do not respect the honour of God immediatly, and in themselves, but by accident, and as parts of Divine Worship by reduction, as it containeth all the adjuncts of Worship.*

Ans. Such Logick was never heard of: 1. If he mean a *Surplice* in the materials, to wit, Linnen and Crossing Physically considered, as separated from their signification, do not tend immediatly to the honour of God, but as an adjunct, he speaketh nonsense, for so Bread, Wine, eating, drinking, Water in Baptisme do not immediatly respect the honour of God, but only as they have a Morall consideration and stand under Divine institution. But yet so the materiall of worship is not the adjunct thereof, but the matter, as the body of a living man is not one adjunct of a man. If he mean, that Ceremonies in a Morall (not in a Physicall) consideration do not immediatly respect the honour of God, but *reductively, and by accident.* Let him show us, if the Surplice doth not as immediatly, and without the intervening mediation of any other thing, signifie *and stir up our mindes* to the remembrance of Pastorall holinesse, as eating all of one bread, doth immediatly stir up our mindes to the remembrance of our Communion of love, that we *be all one body in Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 2. If he mean Ceremonies as such speciall.

ciall materialls, to wit, Surplice, &c. as ordained of man, who may ordain another Ceremony, doth not immediatly respect the honour of God. 1. This is to beg the question: 2. A white garment upon a priest of *Jupiter* Sacrificing to that Idoll should immediatly respect the honour of *Iupiter*, though the Priest might honour *Iupiter* with garments of white Roses, or some other like device, while he officiateth. So bowing of the knee in prayer doth immediatly honour God, though I may pray sitting or standing. 3. It is a dream that the honour of the subject is given to the adjunct, yea, and properly is the adjunct, and agreeth to the adjunct, as Surplice hath the very Office and place of Gods word and Sacraments, to teach and signifie, and yet they are but adjuncts, if a mans Coat, or his Hat, or Shooes could discourse and reason, as only the man can do, in reason we should say the Coat is the man.

2. They say, *God forbiddeth efficient and operative means of Worship, and grace in the second Commandment, or means immediate which worketh by vertue in themselves, or wrapped in them, for so the Word and Sacraments are means of grace and worship; yea, the Sacraments be exhibitive seals, and therefore we owe to such means subjection of conscience immediatly, both to the things instituted, and particular means of admonition, and to the duties admonished or called to our remembrance by them, for they have vertue residing, and inherent in them, by divine institution to work upon us. But God forbiddeth not, in the second Commandment, means that teach occasionally, as* Objectum a quo, *therefore we owe subjection of conscience to the things admonished, but not to the particular means of admonition, therefore we are tied in conscience to Ceremonies only collaterally and* propter aliud, *they be only externall objects or occasions. For whoever* (saith he) *expected that men should be stirred up by Ceremonies, as by causes, or any other wayes, but as by sensible objects, as we are by the sight of the creatures, or other memorials? therefore* (saith he) *they are not means, by the which grace is wrought by the power of God wrapped in them, but resident in God himself, that freely giveth the grace, by the right use of them*: so *D.* Burges: (*b*)

Ans. All cometh to this, Ceremonies taketh the place of *Word and Sacraments*, but cannot fill the chaire, and discharge the office so well as *Gods* Ordinances doth: A Clown taketh on the Crown, and usurpeth the Throne, and cannot do Regall Acts, with such grace

(*b*) *Burges Rejoinder* c.3.Sect.5. p.279. And in a Treatise of kneeling, c.18.q.4. p.57.

grace of Royall Majesty, as the Lawfull King, what, is he for that no usurping Traitor? 2. He will not have Ceremonies to be causes of worship, but occasions so do Papists say: *Images* (saith (c) *Vasquez*) *do only set before us the History and effects of God.* Bellarmine, Suarez (as all know) do say, *That Images cannot so represent* Iehovah, *as he is in himself, or described in his Word, nor can the Idoll or Image of God represent God, as a cause, but onely as an object externall and occasion, and yet God forbiddeth it,* Isa.40.18. Hab.2.19.20. 2. *Gods Word* to the reprobate is a *sealed Book*, and is, as if you would teach letters, to a new weaned childe, *Isa.*29.11. c.29.9. It *worketh by no inherent vertue wrapped in it self*, but though it be mighty, yet is it mighty through God, 2 *Cor.*10.4. *Ioshuahs twelve stones, the Phylacteries, the Manna, the Rainbow, did only*, (as (d) *Aquinas* saith well) *Worke upon the senses and memory.* The word it self doth but work morally or objectively, and is not a cause having the power of God wrapped in it. If Surplice work only as an occasion; the Preachers, Napkin, the bands of women doth so excite the memory and the affection: 3. All our Divines teach, that the *Sacraments are exhibitive seals, but not of themselves, or by any vertue inherent in them* (as Papists say) *but by the power of God*, which worketh by the right receiving of the *Sacraments*, and the Sacraments *Actu Primo* and essentially are only signes, which worketh objectively and occasionally, as you say your unhallowed Ceremonies do: 1. because they are Sacraments essentially, whether they be received by Faith, or nor, and they are exhibitive seals only to believers. 2. Vnbelievers should not prophane the Sacraments by their unworthy receiving of them, if they were not Sacraments to them only signifying, and if they were exhibiting seals to them, then should they receive them worthily, which is against what we suppose: 3. The Fathers, as (a) *Iustine Martyr* (b) *Ireneus* (c) *Epiphanius* (d) *Chrysostom* (e) *Ambrose* prove, that Circumcision, in its nature, except to believers, did only signifie Grace.

5. Here be a most vilde distinction, *That We owe subjection of conscience to the thing admonished, but not to Surplice, or to such means and particular admonishers, but only collaterally:* But 1. is the *Church* ordaining Ceremonies a collaterall Mistresse over the conscience, & who is the other collaterall judge here? who but *Christ?*

2. We

(c) *Vasquez* 3.p.To.1. de ador. 103.c.4. *Cum nos eas formas quibus Deus apparuit depingimus, nolumus aliud quam historiam illam, & effectum ob oculos ponere.*

(d) *Aquin.* 12.q.102. art.6.ad.7. *Et ideo per aspectum hujus signi inducebantur in memoriam suæ legis.*

(a) *Just. Martyre Dialog.cum Tryph. ante medium.*

(b) *Irenæus* l.4.c.30.

(e) *Epiphanius* heresi. 30.

(d) *Chrys.* hom.27. in Gen.

[e] *Ambros* lib.1.de *Abraham* cap.4.

2. We owe this collaterall subjection of Conscience to the *Image of the Trinity*: for though we owe not subjection of Conscience to the image, as such an admonisher, or such an exhorting object; seeing the Word of God may also admonish us of God, yet we owe subjection of conscience to the thing admonished, to wit, to the *blessed trinity*. 3. Neither owe we subjection of conscience to the word, as written with ink on paper, nor to the sound of the word Preached; yea, nor do we owe subjection of Faith to the Word as the Word, but only collaterall: when we say, (*I hope in the Word, (I believe the Word,) I rejoyce in the Word of God*) we take the Word, for *Objetum quo*, and God for *Objectum quod*, for the word is not the formall object of any subjection of Conscience; I owe to the Word, not a subjection of Conscience collaterall or cœquall with the subjection that I owe to God, but only subordinate as to a mean, and to the Word for God, and because it is instituted by God; but I owe subjection of Conscience to God solely, independently, and onely; yea, subjection of Conscience is not due to the Word for its manner of working, and not due to the Ceremonies; because they work not as the Word of God doth (as no wonder, they being but hay and stubble) but subjection of Conscience is due to the Word, because God is the Author of it, and speaketh in it himself, as is clear, *Ier.* 13. 15. *Amos* 3. 8. *Heb.* 2. 3. *Hear, for the Lord hath spoken*, and it is to be received only, and in Conscience yielded unto, *as it is the Word of God*, Isa. 1. 2. 1 Thess. 2. 13. Now because we cannot receive the Surplice, Crossing, Capping, as the Surplice of God, and as the Crossing of Christ; therefore are we not to submit at all to the Doctrines which these unlawfull teaching means doth bring to our memory, because they have no warrant of Christ, to speak or spell us the very language and minde of God, which God hath spoken in his word by his holy *Prophets* and *Apostles*: Yea, though crosses and afflictions work only upon us, as occasions, and externall objects; yet are we to submit our Conscience to them, as to warnings, because they be sent as Gods Messengers appointed by him, as *Mic.* 6. 9. *Hear the Rod, and who hath appointed it.* 4. *Ceremonies work* (saith *Burges*) *as sensible objects, and as other Creatures*; yea, but he is far wide, *the Creature doth book* (*as the Word is, Psal.* 19. *v.* 1.) *the glory of God, and that which may be known of God, is made manifest in them*: *and God hath manifested* (ἐφανέρωσε) *these things*

We owe subjection of Conscience, collaterall only to the word.

השמים מספרים כבוד־אל

things by the Creatures, Rom. 1. 19. But Ceremonies are not books of Gods writing, God hath not written nor booked this upon a Surplice (*Be holy, ye who bear the Vessels of the Lord*) he hath written it in *Isaiahs* book, c. 52. 11. And we submit to the teaching of the Creatures, though they work not upon the soul, as the *Word* and *Sacraments* do, because God hath appointed such books to teach us; *Ergo*, we are in no sort to submit to the *Devils books*, Printed by *Prelats*, or to their Ceremoniall Volumnes, because God hath written nothing upon them; and here by the way, I say it is unlawfull, yea, and Hypocrisie to be devouter then God will have us, as to enlarge the Phylacteries, and make them above Gods measure, *Numb.* 15. 38. To be humble by a mean not appointed of God, *Ioh.* 13. Or to do what God only should do, as to make Annointing Oyl besides Gods Oyl, *Exod.* 30. 31, 32, 33. *Or to set a threshold and a post, beside Gods own threshold*, Ezek. 43. 8. is presumption.

The spirit worketh not with Ceremonies.

Lastly, Gods spirit worketh not with Ceremonies, and so they are as *the offering of Swines blood, and the slaying of a man*; and so Abomination to God, *Isa.* 66. 1, 2. *The holy Spirit is merited to us by Christ*, Ioh. 16. 14. *He shall receive of mine, and shew unto you*: But who can say that the grace of joy in the holy Ghost, wrought by the droning of Organs, and the holinesse taught by Surplice, is a work of the spirit merited by *Christ* as our High Priest? 3. God hath made no promise that he will work by Ceremonies, for the spirit worketh not without the Word; so then I might resist the working of the spirit, and not sin against the Word; and this is *Anabaptists Enthusiasme*: If God work not by them, they be vain and fruitlesse; and the Idol is unlawfull for this, that it profiteth not. Also, the spirits action is either naturall or supernaturall here: If naturall, it is a naturall work, and a naturall spirit, and to be rejected: If supernaturall, we may devise means to produce supernaturall effects, mens Ceremonies can produce supernaturall joy, comfort, peace, and acts of grace purchased to us by *Christs* merit; this is a miracle.

3. They say, *All this may be said against your Circumstances of time and place, for they are appropriated to Religious uses, and not for that made holy parts of Divine Worship.* 2. *Time and place, are new things as our Ceremonies are.* 3. *Spirituall signification maketh Cere-*

Ceremonies ſo much the better, but hindreth them not, but that they may be Rites of meer Order: Burges.

Burges, rejoynder, c.1.S.15. p.57,58.

Anſ. Time, Place, Pulpit, Table-cloath, are new, Phyſically, often, not new Morally, or Religiouſly, they have no Spirituall influence in worſhip. A civill declamation hath the ſame time, place, pulpit with a Preaching; for then, if for application, *you call them Religious*, as *D. Ammes* ſaith well, *An hill whereon a Preacher Preacheth, a Iudge perſwadeth a Law, a Captain ſpeaketh to his Souldiers, is both a Sacred, a Judiciall, a Military hill*, 2. Signification ſpirituall, maketh Ceremonies capable of being ordered: for Surplice wearing, and Croſſing, being Doctrinall, as teaching ſignifying, *ſtirring up the dull affections*, as doth the Word and Sacrament, they require order and decency: Now things of meer order, requireth no ordering, as time & place require not other time & place to circumſtance them right. 2. This is that which Papiſts ſay (as (c) *Suarez*) that by conſequent only, they have ſignification putupon them.

(b) *Ammes*, his freſh ſuit againſt Ceremonies, ib.

(c) *Suarez*, tom. de legib. lib. 4. cap. 1. n. 10. *Præcepta Eccleſiaſtica ſeruntur quatenus conuenientia ſunt ad bonos mores, ut res ſacræ cum debito honore fiant; conſequenter vero interdum habent ſignificationem moralem, quæ homines excitat ad virtutem & ſpem gloriæ.*

Now fourthly, The place, *Matth.* 15. where *Chriſt* reproveth the Traditions of *Phariſees, as Doctrines of men.* The Jeſuit *Vaſquez* his Anſwer is their Anſwer: *Vaſquez*, Tom. 2. in 12. diſp. 152. cap. 4. *That Chriſt reproveth them not becauſe they kept the Traditions of the Elders; Sed quod in falſis præceptis Divinæ legi contrariis putarent eſſe ſummam Religionis: Becauſe they believed all Religion to ſtand in their Traditions, which were contrary to Gods Law, and for their own, omitted Gods Commandments.* And *Suarez*, Tom. de legib. lib. 4. cap. 2. He reproveth what they added, *Tanquam nova, as new things*: *Corduba*, Ad. victor. rel. 1. de poteſtate Eccleſiæ, q. 3. Prop. 6. But *Chryſoſtom*, Hom. 32. in *Matth.* Thinketh better that they had no power to make Laws; yea, (d) he condemneth the Laws written in their forehead.

The place, *Matth.* 15. touching Traditions of the Elders diſcuſſed.

(d) *Fanſcnius*, Concord. Evange. p. 120. *Becanus* the Jeſuit, in opuſc. to. 2. de Analog. vet. et New Teſt. cap. 1. q. 7. n. 13,14,15. reckoneth out three cauſes, why Chriſt reproved all the Traditions of the Phariſees. 1. Becauſe they ſought vain glory in ſome of them, *Matth.* 23. v. 5. 2. They ſought gain of others of their Traditions, *Matth.* 23. 14. 3. They preferred ſome of them to weightier matters of Gods Law. *Anſ.* None of theſe toucheth the point in this text, becauſe the Tradition of waſhing hands, is reproved by Chriſt for want of a lawfull Author, and ſo the matter of it alſo was unlawfull; for Chriſt calleth it a *Doctrine of men.*

But this exposition is false: 1. They brought in Traditions at first for vain glory, *to be called Rabbi*, *Matth.* 23. 7,8. *Ergo*, they thought them not at first of Religious necessity: 2. *Mark* saith, cap. 7.5. *Why walk not thy Disciples according to the Traditions of the Elders?* Therefore the externall practice, and not the internall opinion of necessity and holinesse is condemned, as is clear. *And when the Pharisees saw some of the Disciples eat bread with unwashen hands, they found fault.* The challenge was for an external omission of an outward observance, which may be seen with the eyes; *Ergo*, these Traditions are not condemned by Christ, because they were contrary to Gods Word, or impious; but in this, that they were contrary, because not Commanded; for in the externall Religious act of washing hands, there was no other impiety of a wicked opinion objected to Christs Disciples: for if the Pharisees eye had been satisfied in that the Disciples should wash before they eat, they would not have contended with Christs Disciples, about the Piety of these Traditions, nor about any *inward opinion*, that they added under this Reduplication *as new*, as *Suarez* saith: But the Church which cannot erre, including the Jewish Pope, the High Priest, can adde nothing as new contrary to Gods Law; nor is there any question betwixt the *Pharisees* and the Lords Disciples: Whether the Traditions of the Elders, should be *esteemed the marrow and sum of all Religion*, as *Vasquez* saith; But only anent externall conformity with *walking in the Traditions of the Elders, or not walking*, as is most clear in the Text: It is true, Christ objected they accounted more of mens Traditions, nor of Gods Commandments, as *Papists and Formalists do*: But that was not the state of the question betwixt the Disciples of Christ and the Pharisees. 2. Christ rejecteth these Traditions, by an Argument taken from the want of a lawfull Author, while he calleth them *Precepts of men*, opposed to the *Commandments of God*, and while he saith v. 13. *That every plant not rooted by his heavenly Father, shall be rooted out*; Yea, and Christ expresly proveth their worship vain, because *they taught the fear and worship of God, by the precepts of men, and not by the Word of God*; and Ceremonies are the precepts of men. 3. *Mar.* 7. 10,11,12. He alledgeth their corrupt and false exposition of the fifth Commandment, in saying, It is *a gift whereby Parents may benefit, which Children offer to God, though they help not their Parents in their poverty*

verty,& neceſſity, & ſo you free them from obedience to the fifth Commandment of God, by ſetting up your falſe gloſſe(ſaith Chriſt) which is a human tradition. Then to Chriſt this is a good argument, your corrupting of the fift Cōmandment with your falſe gloſſes is a rejecting of Gods 5. Commandment; why? becauſe it is a doctrine of men, and one of the Phariſees Traditions: For whether they placed operative ſanctity in preferring mens Commandment to Gods or not; none can deny but *Chriſt* reaſoneth againſt theſe evils, becauſe they were *mens Traditions*, otherway *Formaliſts* ſhall be forced to ſay, that if the *Phariſees* have eſteemed them Arbitrary, and of no operative ſanctity, mens Commandments had not been vain worſhip; Chriſts Argument from *Iſa.29.* ſhould prove nothing, for falſe gloſſes and corrupting the fifth Commandment is not vain worſhip, becauſe it is a doctrine of men; for Doctrines of men as only coming from men, and eſteemed Arbitrary, are not vain, ſaith *Formaliſts*; yea, except they be contrary in the matter to Gods Law, and proffered or equalized in the opinion of ſanctity to Gods Law, they are not a whit vain, becauſe they come from men, or are doctrines of men.

4. Chriſt defendeth his Diſciples practice in abſtaining from externall not-waſhing; *Ergo*, he eſteemed the externall waſhing unlawfull: But if the Diſciples abſtinence was becauſe of the impiety of waſhing, and the opinion of ſanctity put upon waſhing, otherwayes Lawfull; he ſhould have defended his Diſciples in a thing unlawfull; for to diſobey the *Elders* and *Church-guides*, who ſate in *Moſes's* chair, and were to he obeyed, *Matth.*23.2,3. in an externall indifferent act of waſhing not contrary to the waſhings commanded in *Moſes Law*, and ſo negatively conforme to Gods Law, is Lawfull, as *Formaliſts* and *Papiſts* both teach; but Chriſt defended his Diſciples in their non-obedience externall, for they were not challenged, for denying the opinion of operative holineſſe to theſe Ceremonies: Chriſt who commanded obedience to ſitters in *Moſes* his chair in all things Lawfull, would have obeyed himſelf, and cleared his Diſciples in ſo far, as they ought to obey, or not to obey.

5. *Vaſquez* ſayes, *Theſe Traditions were unlawfull, becauſe they were invented, Sola voluntate hominum abſque ratione, by the ſole will of men without reaſon.* But ſo are Popiſh Ceremonies, for if they can be proved by the word of God, and the light of nature, they are eſſentiall parts of Gods word, and not accidentall, nor left to the

Churches will. 2. It is good then the Iesuit confesseth the Church from sole will, and so the *Pope* and Prelat can make no Laws, but either Scripture or natures light must warrant them, and sole will cannot rule them: 3. They had as good reason in generall from *Moses* his writings, and the Law-washings, as *Pope* and *Prelats* have for their Traditions. But saith *Vasquez*, *Christ complaineth of these traditions, because they held them to be, Summam Religionis, the marrow of Religion, and took no care of Gods Law.* *Ans.* That will no more prove them to be vain worship, and that the Disciples were to be justified in their non-conformity to these Church washings, then that Gods Disciples, and sound believers under the Old Testament should abstain from keeping Gods Sabbaths, his new-Moons, and from offering Sacrifices, because the people placed all holinesse in these of old, and neglected works of mercy and justice, *Isa.* 1. 11, &c. *Jer.* 7. 4, 5, 6. But (say *Formalists*) Christ condemneth them because the Pharisees thought, *eating with unwashen hands defiled the conscience, and meat defiled the soul, when the eaters did not wash as the elders commanded: Whereas Christ* saith, *It is not that which goeth in at the mouth, which defileth the man, but the wickednesse that cometh out at the heart.* *Ans.* It is true, and I think *Pharisees* believed meat eaten contrary to the Elders Traditions, defiled the conscience, as is clear, *Mat.* 15. 16, 17, 18. And that also Christ condemneth, as a Doctrine of men, and of ignorant men; and so doth non-conformity to your Ceremonies pollute the conscience as a breach of the fifth, and second Command as you say.

Quest. IV.

Whether humane Ceremonies can consist with Order, Decency, and the sincerity of our profession of true Religion?

IV. Arg. *Ceremonies* fight with Order and Decency. 1. These Rites pretended by Gods command, to adde order and decency to Gods worship, and yet deface his worship, and addeth none thereunto be unlawfull: But humane Ceremonies be such; *Ergo*, That they pretend Order is proved. D. *Burges* saith, They *have no place in all the New-Testament*, save only, 1. *Cor.* 14. 26. *Let all things be done in order, and decency*, a place as (*a*) *Estius* citeth, *Magnified by Papists, for all their Ceremonies*: The Major is undeniable, I prove

Estius l. 3. d. 37. p. 139

the

the Assumption: 1. Because Magick-like Rites honoured with Gods name as *Christian-Masse*, *Christs-Masse*, an *Adored Tree* called *Gods board*, when there is no use for a Table, a *Crossing honoured with dedication to Christs service*, is like Gods name used by sorcerers in Charming, Spelling, Divining, where vertue is ascribed to signes, characters and words, which have no such vertue from God or nature, and this *Valentia* justly calleth Superstition. (*b*) So the Iews called the Calfe *Jehovah*, Papists call a creature of their making, *Agnus Dei*, a stile *due to Christ only*, *Joh.* 1.29. 2. All creatures are means of glorifying God, *Rev.* 4.11. *Prov.* 16.4. *Rom.* 11.36. And may be invited to praise God, as *Psal.* 148. Now it were strange bleating, to say, *O Crossing, Surplice, Praise ye the Lord*; when things ordained by mans sole will, and so idle and sinfull, are made means to glorifie God; with as good reason dancing in the Church, and *blowing feathers in the Aire*, which have by nature or reason, no aptitude for these ends, may be decent means of glorifying God. 2. Order and decency supernaturall in the Church is in the Word, *Cant.* 6.4. *Clear as the Sun, terrible as an Army with Banners*: Nothing wanting Gods institution can reach a supernaturall end, as our Ceremonies are: 2. But also Ceremonies relatively sacred in Religious state must be more then civilly decent, as also right order produceth *supernaturall joy*, *Gal.* 2.5. Civill order cannot do this: Or 3. Ceremonies adde naturall order, but this is not in colour, Religions colour is supernaturally white, ingenuous, not whorish: 2. Or then it addeth order of parts, and this is by right, grave, and convenient circumstantiating of things in Gods worship, and *Paul* dreamed never of Crossing to grace baptizing: 3. Or it addeth due quantity, Religious worship hath no quantity but time. 4. It is against sense, that order is commanded in the third Commandment, but not Surplice, Crossing, because they are by accident orderly; what agreeth essentially to the generall, agreeth not essentially and necessarily to the speces and particulars which are by accident under that generall, as what agreeth to a man, agreeth not to white and black men. Decency is commanded, but by accident, and by mans will Surplice is decent. But then God commanding Sacraments, should not command Bread and Wine, for they are by accident, and by Gods will *Sacraments*, he might have chosen other Elements, yet the will of *God* commanding *Sacraments*,

(b) *Gregor. de valent. to.* 3. *dis* 6. *q* 13. *pun.* 1. *Si effectus intentus superet vim medii, erit superstitio.*

Ceremonies Magicall.

If the third Commãdment, command Decency in its generality, as they say, then it must command decency in this, or this Rite, as in Surplice, Crossing, &c.

ments, commandeth this and this Sacrament also: What agreeth essentially to man, agreeth essentially to all men black and white. If *Gods* will essentially concur to constitute decency in his own worship, then must that same will essentially concur to constitute this decency, in *Surplice*, *Crossing*. 2. It supposeth a great untruth, that *Crossing* is not worship, because not ordained of God, but that proveth it is not Lawfull worship, but not, that it is non-worship, for *Crossing* used to the honour of *Baal*, and to edifie souls in performing their duty to *Baal*, is essentially a worshipping of *Baal*, otherwayes worshipping of *Idols* is not *Worship*, and yet it is an Act of Religious honouring of the *Idol*. 3. The Command that commandeth, or forbiddeth the end, commandeth and forbiddeth the means (*Thou shalt not murther*) forbiddeth the Master, not to command his servant to ride an extreamly deep and impetuous River, though the not riding of such a River be not set down in the word, and it is not forbidden as an Arbitrary action: If therefore decency binde the conscience, then the decency of this Rite, to wit, *Crossing* bindeth the conscience; Our Ceremonies are not Nationall; for *Crossing* being a *Religious Rite*, in all the world its alike decent; *Ergo*, non-Crossing in some Country cannot be undecent; Things meerly Religious, as all significant Ceremonies are of alike nature every where, and admit not of heat and cold with divers climates, are of good or evil manners, with divers Nations, therefore they must be determined in the word; the man who Prefaced on our Service book said, *Without some Ceremonies it is impossible to keep any order, or quiet Discipline in the Church.* I am sure he must think that *Paul* preached in some *Surplice* that he might teach holinesse with his garments one way or other, he hath a stronger Faith then I can reach; without circumstances worship cannot be, but without Romish dirt, the Worship and Discipline are better kept, then with such whorish busking.

V. Arg. Iewish and Popish Ceremonies are professions of a false Religion.

Also whatever is a profession in fact, of a false Religion by Ceremonies indifferent, and yet proper to a false Religion, is a denying of the true Religion, but the using of these Ceremonies, used by Papists and Iews is such; *Ergo*, The Proposition is Scripture, *Gal.* 2. 14. *Peter* lived after the manner of the Iews, in using the Religious materials of the *Jews*, though he had no Iewish intention or opinion; yea, *Acts* 10. he disputeth against that: So

Cir-

Circumcision, *Galathians* 6.14,15. is put for the *Jewish Church.* Now *Altars, Organs, Iewish Ephods, or Surplice, Masse-cloaths, and Romish Crossing, bowing to Altars, Images,* are badges of Iewish and Popish Religion: We know the dispute betwixt *Augustine* and *Ierome*, who defended *Peters* dissimulation, *Gal.* 2. to gain the Iews: But *Augustine* saith, Epist. 9. *Si propterea illa Sacramenta celebravit* (Paulus) *quia simularet se judæum, ut illos lucrifaceret, cur non etiam Sacrificavit cum Gentibus, quia & iis, qui sine lege erant, tanquam sine lege factus est, ut eos quoq; lucrifaceret?* Yea, then (as *Augustine* saith to *Ierome*, Epist. ad Hyeronym, 19.) *We might use all the Iewish Ceremonies to gain the Iews, and so fall in the Hererſie of* Ebion *and the* Nazarites. *Duvallius*, 2. Thom tract. de legib. q. 3. Art. 3. would defend *Peter* in that; but he saith, *Magis placet Barronii Responsio.* Tom. 1. Annal. an. 51. *Petrum venialiter peccasse*: As for *Pauls* Circumcising of *Timothy*, Papists clear him. *Vasquez*, Tom. 1. in 12. disp. 181. cap. 8. *Loco & tempore accomodato*, He did it when he could not offend the *Gentiles*: *Aquinas*, 12. q. 103. Art. 4. Yea, so the Fathers, as *Augustine*, Epist. 19. *Chrysostom, Cyrill, Hyeronym.*

Also *Papists, Bensonius*, tractat. de fuga, lib. 1. disp. 1. q. 4. ad Articul. 4. *Vasquez*, Tom. 1. 12. disp. 182. cap. 4. *Prove to use Iewish Ceremonies, though with no Iewish minde is unlawfull: Suarez* Tom. de legib. lib. 9. de leg. Divin. pos. cap. 14. *Usus Circumcisionis ex prohibitione est factus malus, & actus malus non honestatur propter intentionem bonam. Aquinas* 22. q. 11. et 12. q. 103. Art. 4. *As one should mortally sin, who should say, Christum nunc nasciturum, Christ is yet to be incarnat, So the using of the Iewish Ceremonies were a lie in fact. Cajetan*, and *Toletus*, acknowledge *a lie in fact. Salmeron*, in *Gal.* 5.q.2. saith, *It is unlawfull to use the* Iewish *Ceremonies. Ægidius Comick.* de actib. supernatural. lib. 2. disp. 15. dub. 3. n. 39. *Nullo modo licet ob ullum. finem, uti Ceremoniis propriis falsæ Religionis. Vasquez*, 12. disp. 182. n. 48. *Patres & Doctores communiter tenent non licere: Lodo. Meratius Iesuita*, to. 1. in Thom. tract. de legib. disp. 19. Sect. 2. n. 5. *Mentiti fuissent Apostoli usurpantes exteriores legis Mosaicæ Ceremonias si non ex animo usurpabant, tanquam sibi vere licitas, ex animo vere colendi Deum per illas, sicut ab aliis per easdem colebatur.* So *Grego. Valent.* Tom. 2. disp. 7. punct. 7. q. 7. *Soto* de justif. l. 2. q. 5.

It

Arg. 6. It is a Religious scandall to the users of these Ceremonies: for Ceremonies devised by men, of no necessary use in Gods worship, are monuments of Idolatry, snares drawing the practisers to Idolatry, and so unlawfull, as the High places, Groves, Images, though not Adored of the Canaanites. This Argument is so learnedly prosecuted by *D. Ammes*, that I adde nothing to it.

D. *Ammes* fresh suit.

QUEST. V.

Whether the Ceremonies, especially kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacrament, be guilty of idolatry?

Arg. 7. WHoever presumeth to invent a worship of his own, committeth Idolatry interpretatively, because he worshippeth a God whom he conceiveth is pleased with false worship: But that is not the true God, for he is pleased with no worship, but what he hath prescribed himself; but all inventers and practisers of humane Ceremonies, worship such a God: Also, all who usurpeth the room and place of God, give the glory of God to creatures; but all Authors and practisers of humane Ceremonies, take the room and place of God, from God, and give it to creatures, because to ordain worship, and all Religious means of worship, is proper to the only wise Law-giver: But for the clearing of this Question, I divide it in some subordinate Questions.

Of Religious kneeling.

(a) *Raphael de la Torres*, ordin. prædicat. tom. 1. in 22. Tho. q. 84. tra. 2. disp. 5.

SECT. I.

Whether Religious kneeling, laying aside our intention and will to Adore that before which we kneel, of its own nature be Adoration?

This Question is most necessary, both against *Papists and Formalists*: But first remember, that (a) *Raphael de la Torres*, a late Schoolman, maketh seaven Adorations: 1. Bowing of the knee. 2. Prostration. 3. The lifting up of the eyes. 4. Of the hands to Heaven. 5. Kissing. 6. Knocking on the Breast. 7. Uncovering of the head: Though this last be not Adoration, but a Nationall sign of Reverence, and is not every where Adoration; yet (b) *Abulensis* saith, the Iews did pray and Sacrifice with covered heads: So saith (c) *Virgill*, and (d) *Lod. Vives*: Therefore the *Corinthians* had this from the *Grecians* as a civil sign of gravity, which should not be banished from Gods worship; and if it be appropriate to an Idol, it should in that case be made Veneration: But no Reverence

(b) *Abulensis* in *Levit.* cap. 13. q. 10.

(c) *Virgil.* An. 3. *Et capiteante aras phrygio velatus amictu.*

(d) *Lod. Vives* com. in *August.* de civit. dei lib. 15. c. 2.

at

at all is due to an Idol. Jesuits, as (e) *Suarez* and others, and Formalists, *Morton*, *Burges*, *Hooker* teach us, That Religious bowing before a creature, if there be no intention of Adoring, is not Adoration: But it is to be considered;

(e) *Suarez*, Tom. 1. in 3. Thom. q. 25 art. 5. Sect. 4.

1. Bowing of the knee Physically or civilly, is indifferent and is not Adoration: for we bow to Kings, and Artificers may bow the knee to drive a nail in a bed, and yet are not Adoring; but Religious Adoration, whither ye will or not by natures impression is a Religious note of Religious submission.

2. I consider four acts of the soul that may convoy externall Adoration. 1. One of the minde, a consideration of the excellency of what we Adore: 2. A will to submit to this excellency: 3. The judgements diting this to be honest to submit: 4. A purpose or intention habituall or actuall of Adoring; many of these may be where there is no Adoring: and the Religious externall bowing of the body is essentially Adoring, when that bowing is in a state of worship: kneeling before consecrated Elements for Reverence of either God or the Elements, must be Adoration, though we should wash it with foul water, and say, that there is no intention to tender Gods glory to these Elements.

Four things in Adoration.

3. Let it be considered what is said by the (f) Jesuit *Joannes de Lugo, the Popes Professor at Rome*, which I propound with some change: 1. There is a purpose of externall Adoring, with an inward submission of the heart; whether this be an habituall or actuall intention, it is sure it is an Adoration, when it cometh forth in a gesture of Adoring. 2. A will to bow the body in scorn and derision, as the Souldiers bowed the knee before *Jesus*; and this being not in a state of worshipping, but in a state and case of disgracing, is not Religious bowing or Adoration: This is not a naturall expression of inward submission, but rather of disgrace. 3. There is a willed or voluntary Religious bowing for fear, for gain, or for glory; yet without any internall estimation of the excellency of the thing Adored. This *Suarez* denyeth to be worshipping, it being only a faining of worship, not a worshipping.

(f) *Joannes de Lugo*, de myster. incarnat, dis. 23. Sect. 2. n. 23.

But I prove the contrary: 1. Because then no enacted worshipping of Idols, were indeed a worshipping of an Idol, and yet all the time that the Adorer boweth his knee to the Idol, though he have no inward purpose of heart to Adore the externall bowing,

Intention of worship not essentiall to worship.

must be a naturall expreſſion of actuall ſubmiſſion to the thing before which we bow, and a conciliating of an opinion with others, of Religious eminency and ſubjection of Divine dignity, to that thing before which we kneel. 2. Religious kiſſing of the *Calves of Samaria, Hoſ.* 8. is a naturall expreſſion of Religious love to theſe Calves, though the kiſſer have no intention of worſhipping. 3. *Act.* 14. 11, 12, 13. The men of *Lyſtra* are reproved for Sacrificing, and ſo for Adoring-men; 15. *Sirs, Why do ye theſe things for we alſo, are men of like paſſions as you, and Preach to you that ye ſhould turn from theſe Vanities to the living God? Barnabas and Paul* rebuketh the men of *Lyſtra*, becauſe they worſhipped men with humane paſſions; yet did they not intend to worſhip men, for they were to them in that act of worſhipping, *Gods in mens ſhape*, as they ſay, v. 11. *Gods are come down to us in the likeneſſe of men*; if they conceived them not to be men indeed, but *Gods* come down from heaven; then could they not intend to worſhip men, but Gods: So *Iohn* would not, nor had any purpoſe to worſhip a created Angel; but taking him to be God, he fell down and worſhipped, as is clear by the Angels reproofe, *Rev.* 19. 10. *He ſaid unto me, See thou do it not, I am thy fellow ſervant*: Likewiſe, *Act.* 17. The *Athenians* ſet up an Altar not to the Pourtraict of gold, which yet they worſhipped, v. 2. 4, 5. but intended not to worſhip it; *But the God which made heaven and earth, whom Paul preached*: So are the *Gentiles* ſaid to *offer to Devils, not to God*, what they offer, 1 *Cor.* 10. 20. *Deut.* 37. 17. *Pſal.* 106. 37. and 2 *Chron.* 11. 15. *Ieroboams Calves* are *Devils*; and yet they intended not to worſhip *Devils*, but *God*, that brought them out of the Land of *Ægypt*, 1 *King.* 12. 28.

Alſo to intend worſhip is eſſentiall to worſhip, as ſincere and hearty; *Ergo*, it is not eſſentiall to worſhip in generall, as what is eſſentiall to the ſpece as ſuch, is not eſſentiall to the general that comprehendeth that ſpece.

4. If Religious kneeling require that we intend to worſhip every thing, before which, as an object, we do Religiouſly kneel; then Religious kneeling ſhould not ſignifie internall ſubmiſſion of the heart by natures impreſſion or Divine inſtitution; but by the voluntary and the free inſtitution of him that kneeleth: But this latter is abſurd, for if kneeling ſhould ſignifie, what it doth ſignifie by our free and voluntary appointment: Then we might 1. put upon naturall geſtures what ſignification we pleaſed, and were not to ſtand to the ſignification which God and nature have put upon kneeling. 2. So it were in mans power to impoſe upon Religious

kneeling

kneeling to God, civill curteſie, ſuch as a ſubject expreſſeth to his Prince, or a ſon to his Father, and it were free to us to kneel to a ſtock, and that Religiouſly, and yet put upon kneeling the negative reverence, that we give to the Bible; and it were in the three childrens will to kneel to *Nebuchadnezzars* Image, and impoſe this ſignification on the geſture, that they were kneeling to God only, all which are manifeſtly falſe: ſo (g) *Field* ſaith, kneeling hath inſtitution from the inſtinct of nature.

(g) *Field* of the Church, 4. book cap. 31.

They Object, 1. *The externall act of kneeling ſignifyeth the inward ſubmiſſion of heart, but there is no inward ſubmiſſion of the heart to a thing to which we kneel, when we are compelled to kneel only for fear of men, or induced to kneel for hope of glory, or ſome by-reſpect without any intention or purpoſe to adore, therefore this externall Adoration is a falſe ſigne, and ſignifieth not a thing as it is, and ſo is no worſhip.*

Anſ. That *externall bowing is not true, but falſe*: I diſtinguiſh, *it is not true Morally*, becauſe it is a falſe ſigne, and a ſinfull abuſing of worſhip, for there ought to be a bowed heart, when there is a bowed knee, but if the meaning be, this externall bowing is not true *metaphyſically*, and partaketh not of the nature of Religious worſhipping, it is falſe, for it is truly worſhip, and the eſſence and definition of worſhip agreeth to it: for from Religious bowing there reſulteth by the nature of the externall Act, which is of divine inſtitution, an honouring of that before which we do bow, as before a propoſed object, what ever be the preſent purpoſe or intention of the bower: elſe if I bow to an Idol intending, and conveying in my heart-purpoſe all honour to God only, I ſhould not worſhip an Idol: The three Children caſt into the fiery Furnace did but refuſe externall bowing to *Nebuchadnezzar*, and would hazard upon burning quick, before they ſhould give that to the Image; for the Kings commandment was not, that all ſhould give and convey in purpoſe of heart to that Image all divine glory, but only Religious proſtration before it; yet the three Children ſay, *Dan.3. Well, be it known to thee, O king, that we will not ſerve thy Gods, nor worſhip thy golden Image*, לא נסגד They expreſly refuſe knee-bowing, & the reaſon is, becauſe if ye bow your knee Religiouſly to a ſtock, it is not in your power or free choice, to ſtay the flux and motion of Religious honour off, or from the ſtock; but be-

Religious bowing of its nature, not by mans free and Arbitrary intention ſignifieth divine Adoration.

becauſe Religious bowing doth not convey honour to the thing before which ye bow by your free will, but by God and natures inſtitution, even as weeping naturally expreſſeth ſorrow, laughing, gladneſſe, ſo doth Religious bowing ſignifie Religious honouring, without any act of the free choice of the worſhipper intervening. It is impoſſible to adore God, in and through an Image, and give no Religious reverence to the Image at all; as it is impoſſible to hear the word and tremble at it; and yet none of that Religious trembling be bounded and terminated upon the Word; as it is impoſſible to kneel to the Kings Ambaſſador conveying all and whole that civill honour to the King, but ſome honour muſt redound to the Ambaſſador; a father cannot love the Doctor for his ſons cauſe, but ſome love he muſt confer really upon the Doctor, if not abſolute, yet relative, for his ſons cauſe. *Jacob* could not kiſſe *Joſeph* his ſons coat, and yet refer that whole expreſſed affection to *Ioſeph* and nothing at all to the coat, for then ſhould there be no reaſon, why he ſhould kiſſe the coat, rather then the skin of the beaſt ſuppoſed to be the devourer of his ſon; if therefore the Communicant ſhould kiſſe the *Sacramentall Bread*, as he boweth Religiouſly before it, as the object of his *Sacramentall Worſhip*, which he receiveth, I hope it would be thought very like the kiſſing of the *Calves of Samaria*, and a Religious expreſſion of love to the bread, and by the ſame caſe, Religious bowing to God, by the interveening of bread a repreſentative object, muſt be an expreſſion of Religious honouring of Bread, but no Religious honouring by Religious bowing can be expreſſed, but Adoration of bread; for as I have proved, it is not in our free Election that Religious kneeling ſignifie what honour we pleaſe, as if it were in our power, that Religious kneeling ſignifie Religious, or civill honour, or more, or leſſe Religious honour, but our will or thoughts cannot change the nature of things; kneeling is eſſentially Religious, as (*a*) *Iohannes Delugo* defineth it, *Nota ſubmiſſionis internæ.*

(*a*) *Ioannes de Lugo, de myſteri incarnat, diſp.* 13. S. 2. n. 14.

2. (*b*) Suarez objecteth, *Adoration is a voluntary action proceeding from the Will of the Adorer; and therefore excluding this Will, it is not Adoration, but only the materiall action of adoring; alſo adoration is honouring, but none can honour without an intention of honoring, and therefore he who externally giveth ſignes of honour to an Idol without an intention to honour the Idol, doth not truly honour and adore the Idol, but only diſſembleth.* Anſ.

(*b*) *Suarez* to. 1. in 3. q. 25. art. 5. S. 4. Objection of *Suarez* contending that intention of adoring is eſſentiall to Adoration, removed.

Anſ. *Qui benè diſtinguit benè ſolvit*: Our third diſtinction doth well anſwer this: The naked materiall action of bowing Phyſically conſidered, wanting all Religious will of adoring is not an honouring; if a Carpenter bow before an Image to drive a naile in it, he doth not worſhip the Image, becauſe that is an action, *In ſtatu artis, non in ſtatu Religionis*; *In a ſtate of Art, not in a Religious ſtate*: But the voluntary bowing before any thing in a ſtate of worſhip, or Religion, as its here, is Adoration; for there is voluntary bowing in a Religious way of a ſtate, but there is not required a particular intention to Adore the ſigne, that is accidentall to the nature of worſhip.

Suarez objecteth, *The eſſence of Adoration requireth the intention of the Adorer, therefore the adoring of this, or that thing, requireth a proportionable intention of adoring the thing.*

Anſ. 1. The Antecedent is not univerſally true, and is a begging of the queſtion, becauſe externall adoring of an Idol may be without intention to adore an Idol. 2. Though the Antecedent were true; that an abſolute Adoration of God requireth the intention of the doer, as it is not true; Lawfull and ſincere Adoration indeed requireth the intention, but not abſolute adoration: Though (I ſay) it were true, yet it followeth not that a relative adoration requireth an intention of giving co-adoration or relative worſhip to the ſigne.

Suarez. 3. Objecteth: *The honouring of one thing cannot properly be called the honouring of another thing different therefrom, except that honouring be ſome way referred by the minde, to that other thing, or except they be partakers one of another; but the Image, and firſt ſamplar, or prototype are different things, therefore the honouring of the firſt ſamplar cannot be called the honouring of the* Image, *except the honouring by the intention be referred to the* Image. I anſwer, The *Image* and *Samplar* are one in a ſinfull imagination, as *Jehovah* and the *Golden Calf* are one, but it followeth not, that there muſt be two diſtinct intentions, one in adoring the Prototype, and in co-adoring the Image another: But he who intendeth to honour the *King* in his Ambaſſadors perſon, needeth not two intentions, one by which he intendeth to honour the *King*, another whereby he intendeth to honour his Ambaſſador.

CAP.

SECT. II.

Whether the Idolatrous Jews were charged with the crime of Idolatry, because they adored the creature as such, or because they adored the Godhead in, with, or under the creatures shape? and whether or no, do Papists commit Idolatry with them in this point:

Of the Idolatrous worship of the Iews and Papists.

LEt these considerations go before.

1. *That the Jews believed the* Image *to be God by way of representation, not essentially or really; they believed the* Image *to be God objective, commemorative, representative, relative, declarative, significative; Non essentialiter, non per se, non realiter.*

2. *There is an honour or negative reverence due to any* Image *of God, ordained by himself, or to any mean of honouring God, because it is such, though it cannot be expressed in the act of Adoration; but the question is, if the honour of adoration, either relative or absolute be due to the Image?*

3. *The Jews intended to honour* Jehovah *in their* Images, *What inferiour intention they had to honour the* Image, *we are now to inquire.*

4. *We bow our knee two wayes before a creature, either before a creature as an object by accident, as while we pray, there of necessity must be before us some creature, a Wall, a Table, a Pulpit, none of these are adored, because they are before us by accident, as having no Religious state. The* Image *before the* Iew, *and the Sacramentall elements before the kneeler, cannot be thus present: 2. The creature is before the kneeler, of Religious purpose, as a Religious object.*

5. *The Creature is Religiously present before the kneeler two wayes,* 1. *Active.* 2. *Passive.* 1. *In the meer and naked act of teaching and exciting the memory, so that when that act is past, I turne from the creature, and adore the Creator; So at the sight of the Sun or Moon being taught and instructed of the wisdom and power of God, in creating such excellent creatures, I am to turn from them, and adore the Lord of these creatures. Thus the creatures are kindely and* per se *objects in the act of teaching, but not objects at all in the act of adoration: 2. The creatures are objects passive, when bodily bowing in a religious state is directed toward the creatures really and bodily present by a commandment of the Church, or of purpose, and so they are made objects of Adoration.*

I. *Con-*

I. *Conclusion.* The relative expression of God which is in the works of God, is no formall ground of any Adoration of the creatures. 1. Because Adoration upon this ground, though the creatures, the Hoast of Heaven be excellent, is forbidden, *Deut.* 4. 19. 2. Not only Images (which cannot represent God) and the Sacraments, but all the creatures, even, Rats, Mice, Flyes, Frogs, Worms, *Iudas* and wicked men, yea, and *Devils* are to be worshipped, because all things having being, are shadows and footsteps of God, their cause, first Author, and last end, *Psal.* 19. 1. *Psal.* 103. 22. *Rom.* 1. 19,20. *Act.* 17. 27,28, *Prov.* 16. 4. *Rev.* 4. 11. *Rom.* 11. 36,37. 3. Because God is really, and by the diffusion of his blessed essence, present in all creatures, it followeth not that we should Adore them: The *Formalists* upon this ground, that *Christ* is really present in the Sacrament, though the manner we know not, think that *Christ* should be Adored in the Sacrament, according to that, *Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus.* But if this be good Logick, because we know not the way of the Spirit, and how the bones grow in a woman with childe, *Eccles.* 11. v. 5. And God, where he worketh, is present by the immediation of essence and power, though we know not the way of his presence, we are to Adore the soul of man, and the bones of a young childe in a womans belly; & though they should say that God-man Christ is in a more powerfull and efficacious manner present in the Sacrament, then in the works of nature; yet should it follow, that God is to be worshipped in the works of nature also: for *Magis & minus non variant Speciem*, for then we could not conclude any thing but this: Though there be not so reall a ground of Adoring Lice and Frogs, as Adoring of the Sacrament: Yet there is a ground, seeing God is, in the reality of his blessed essence, present in all creatures. The relative expression of God in the creature, no ground of Adoring the creature.

II. *Conclusion.* The Idolatrous Jews did not Adore the golden Calf, as a creature, but as God by representation, *Exod.* 32. 4. *And when Aaron had made thereof a golden Calf, they said, These be thy Gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Ægypt.* 5. *And when Aaron saw it, he built an Altar before it, and Aaron made Proclamation, and said, To morrow is a Feast to* Iehovah. Now that they believed not the golden Calf to be really and essentially Iehovah, is more then evident: 1. Because they believed not *Moses* to be essentially God, but their guide and leader under God; but this The Iews believed not the golden Calf to be really God.

this Calf they made to supply the want of *Moses*, v. 1. *The people gathered themselves together against Aaron, and said unto him, Up, make us gods which shall go before us: For as for this Moses the man that brought us up out of the Land of Ægypt, we know not what is become of him.* They made then the Calf only a visible God under Iehovah, to lead them in *Moses* his place. 2. There is no reason why they should have made *Aaron* rather the maker of the Calf then another; but because he being the *Lords Priest*, they thought by his holinesse, the Godhead of Iehovah did slide into this Calf; and so they held the Calf to be a thing different from Iehovah. 3. They say to *Aaron, Make us gods: Ergo*, they believed Iehovah to be before this made Calf. 4. They saw the Calf melted before their eyes, & knew it was made of their ear-rings. 5. They call it Iehovah, & yet they made it Iehovah, and therefore they differenced betwixt the Calf & Iehovah: for they knew that Iehovah brought them out of *Ægypt* before the Calf was framed, but the Calf was an Image of that Iehovah. (a) *Bellar.* and (b) *Gregor. de Valent.* say, *They worshipped not Iehovah, but a vain Idol: Else how is it said*, Psal. 106. *when they made this Calf, that they forgot the Lord, if they worshipped God in the Calf; they were mindefull of God.* It is vain reasoning this, the wife that taketh another Husband to bed with her, *Morally* forgetteth her husband; and to worship God in a memorative signe forbidden of God, is a forgetting of God, and a false God indeed. 2. Those who acknowledge that the Heathen believe that some Godhead dwelt in Images, and gave Responses and Answers out of them; do thereby acknowledge, that the Image it self had not the honour of giving Responses, as God hath, but that the incloſed *Godhead* gave these Responses, and therefore the incloſed *Godhead* was that which they worshipped. So (c) *Aquinas*, and (d) *Vasquez* saith, The Heathen acknowledged a *Godhead* to dwell in the Images: And (e) *Bellarmine* saith, It is not improbable that the Iews believed that they worshipped the true God in an Idol: *Papists* then may take to them Heathens Idolatry, for Heathens worshipped God in Images, and not Images as they are such: and (f) *Abulensis*, and (g) *Caje-*

(a) *Bellar.* contr. tom. 2. l. 2 c. 13.

(b) *Gregor. de Valent.* to. 3. dis. 6. q. 11. de Idolat. punct. 6.

(c) *Aquinas*, par. 3. q. 25. art. 3. ad. 2. *Adorabant Gentiles ipsas imagines ut res quasdam, credentes iis inesse aliquid numinis propter responsa quæ dæmones in ipsis dabant, & alios mirabiles effectus.* (d) *Vasquez*, in 3. tom. 1. q. 25. disp. 91. art. 3. *Verissimum est quod tradit Augustinus Gentiles pro diis habuisse ipsamet simulachra, putantes in ipsis numen aliquod latere, cum illis responsa darent.* (e) *Bellar.* ibid. (f) *Abulensis*, in *Exodus* 23. (g) *Cajetan*, in *Exodus* 23.

tan

tan in the Commentaries of the first Edition, on *Exodus*, said this same. 3. Though the Iews believed the Calf to be essentially God, yet it was God as God that they intended to worship, not the work of mens hands as such: *Papists* believe that the Image is not God, and yet give the highest worship that is to them. 4. *Bellarmine* saith with us, when he saith, *They saw a Calf in Ægypt and Adored it, they believed Jehovah himself to be a Calf, therefore they made the image of a Calf, and Dedicated it to Jehovah.* But (I Answer) That Image so Dedicated, they worshipped as Iehovah, and called the very materiall Calf Iehovah, and Dedicated it to the Honour of Iehovah; therefore they believed the Lord Iehovah, and the Calf Dedicated to his Honour, (which Calf also they worshipped) to be two divers things, as the Image and the thing signified are *Relata* and opposite: *Ergo*, they believed not that that Image which *Aaron* had made, was Iehovah essentially; therefore in setting up that Image, they worshipped it not as a creature. *All the Prophets* (saith he) *proveth that the Idols are not gods, because they speak not, they neither see, nor hear*, Isa. 46. Psal. 113. *But* (say some Papists) *there was no question if they did see and hear by way of naked representation, because they represented gods and men in shape, who see and hear.* *Ans.* first, If all granted they were living things, which did hear and see by representation; the Prophets did well to prove, they should not be trusted in, nor feared as Images, nor should that *Godhead* within them inclosed, be feared, because it cannot speak with the mouth, nor see, nor hear, nor walk, with their eyes, eares, and feet: and so it was a vain thing to make it a representation of God, who by serving these dead things did help them. But the Prophets strongly prove these Images, and the supposed *Godheads* in them, were dumbe, deafe, blinde, and dead; and therefore neither sign, nor supposed deity represented by the sign, was to be Adored. Also, Isa. 40. 18. *To whom then will ye liken God? Or what likenesse will ye compare unto him?* 19. *The Workman melteth a graven Image, and the Goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, &c.* Isa. 46. 5, 6. *To whom will ye liken me? and make me equall, and compare me, that we may be alike?* 9. *I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me.* Then it is more then clear that they made a likenesse, a comparison, and a similitude betwixt the golden Image and Iehovah: *Ergo*, they be-

lieved not that the Image was essentially God; for every thing like to another, must be divers from that to which it is like (they being relatives and opposites) the one cannot be essentially the other; and he proveth they are not God by representation, Isa. 46. *They cannot move out of their places, except they be born upon Asses or mens shoulders:* And this is the Holy Ghosts Argument, *I am God*, Ergo, *there is none like me* by representation to be worshipped: All assimilation or comparative likenesse made by man, betwixt Iehovah and God, is an Idolatrous assimilation; yea the Lords Argument, Isa. 46. is this, every thing made like unto me, before which ye fall down to worship, as a memorative Image of me, must be a living thing at least, that can move out of his place, and answer your cry when ye pray, and save you out of trouble, ver. 7. Isa. 46. And yet it is but a likenesse of God, ver. 6. Now I Assume, but the Papists Image, and the Formalists Sacramentall elements before which they Religiously kneel, cannot move out of their place, nor answer the Prayers of those who bow to them, nor save them out of trouble: *Ergo*, they cannot be Adored as Images, with Religious bowing; nor can they say, the Images or Sacramentall elements can teach and represent God. I Answer, So did the Iewish Images represent God, and yet God convinceth them of Idolatry, Isa. 40. 18. Isa. 46. 6,7. Ier. 10. *They were but Doctrines of Vanity and Lyes*, and Hab. 2 19. *Woe be to him who saith to the Wood, Awake, and to the dumbe stone, Arise, it shall teach.* And though the Sacramentall elements be lawfull teaching and representing signes, as being the Ordinances of *Christ Jesus*; yet the office of teaching cannot elevate and extoll them to the state of Religious worship, because though the elements be lawfull Images, and in this they differ from Iewish and Popish Images; yet that which is Adored must be such as can hear Prayers, Isa. 46. 7. though it be the Image of God. But the Sacramentall elements are not such as can hear Prayer, *&c.*

The Adoring of Images not forbidden by the Ceremoniall, but by the Morall Law.

Also, that the Adoring of Images is not forbidden by a Ceremoniall Law only, is clear: 1. By Gods Argument, (Isa. 40. 18.) *To whom will ye liken me?* That is, no created thing can represent God, which is of mans devising (for the elements of Gods institution do represent Christ) and Isa. 46. 9. *I am God, and there is none beside me*: *Ergo*, no invention of man can represent me. This Argument is taken from Gods nature, and therefore is of perpetuall verity.

rity. 2. The *Apostle Paul* in the New-Testament repeateth this same Argument, *Act.* 17. to the heathen *Athenians* who were tyed by no Ceremoniall Law of God, ver. 29. *We ought not to think that the God-head is like unto Gold*; You see these people are challenged of Idolatry, who did but erect an Altar to the golden likenesse and Image of God, and yet they did not worship that golden Image, as such; but they worshipped in, and by the Image, *v.* 23, 24. *The God preached by Paul who made the world.*

Hear what (*a*) *Suarez* (*b*) *Bellarmine* and Papists say, *It is not Lawfull to represent God by a proper and formall similitude, which representeth his essence; but it is Lawfull to represent him by Images Analogically, signifying such a forme or shape in the which he appeared in Scripture, according to these metaphors, and mysticall significations, that are given to him in Gods word.*

(*a*) *Suarez* tom. 3. q. 25. dis. 1. in 54. art. 3 Sect. 2.
(*b*) *Bellar.* to. 2. de relig. sanct. lib. 2. c. 8.

Ans. 1. Why should not unwritten Traditions (which to Papists are Gods word) expresse to us Gods nature in Images, no lesse then the written word? 2. The Heathen did represent God by the Image of a man, with eyes, nose, tongue, ears, head, hands, feet, heart, understanding, all which are given to God in Scripture, yet were they Idolaters in so doing, because God saith, *Isa.* 46. 9. *I am God, and there is none like to me.* 3. If we may portraict God according to all metaphors given unto him in Scripture, then ye may Portraict him, in the shape of a *Lyon, a Leopard, a Bear, a Man full of Wine, a Theef stealing in the night, an unjust Iudge, a Gyant, a man of War on horse-back*, &c. All which were folly; and we might worship a Lyon, a Bear, an unjust Iudge, a theef stealing in the night, a man mad with the spirit of jealousie. 4. The Essence and specifick nature of nothing in Heaven and earth, can be portraicted or painted, no more then Gods essence; all painted things are but such and such things by externall proportion and shape; and it is unreasonable to say that Portraicts and Pictures of God, Physically impossible to the Art of Craftsmen, are forbidden only (whereas the Lords word setteth down to us no precepts for Art, as for painting, Musick, speaking right Latine) whereas the Lord forbiddeth universally Gods pictures in any thing in heaven, on earth, or under the earth, *Deut.* 4. 15. *Take ye therefore good heed to your selves, for ye saw no manner of Image on the day that the Lord spake to you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire.*

The evasions of *Bellarmine* and *Suarez* answered.

(c) *Joannes Roinaldus de idolatriâ Ecclesiæ Roman, lib.* 2.cap.9.
(d) *Valent.* ibid.
(e) *Lindsey* pretended Bishop of *Edinbrough* parth. Assembly, pag.29.

Gregor de Valent. saith, *We give not divine honour to the creature as to God, or to Christ, for that honour pertaineth to God or Christ, which conciliateth to him reverence due to God only, and that opinion of divine honour is conciliated to God, or Christ,* Coram, & in imaginibus, *before, and in, or through the* Image.

Ans. The people of God had not that opinion every way of *Egypt*, and their horses, that they had of God; and yet when they, *Isa.* 31. give that to *Egypt* and *horses*, which is due to God, to wit, their Faith and confidence, that they could save in the time of trouble, therefore interpretatively they made Gods of them; otherwayes they knew literally, *that Pharaohs horses were flesh and not spirit:* but Morally and spiritually they knew them not to be no Gods to save them: It is no more absurd that the Prophets say, *The Idol hath eyes and see not, and that it is not God*, though by sense they knew it not to be God, but by representation they trusting in the Idol as in God, then it was for *Isaiah* to say, *The horses of* Egypt *are flesh and not spirit:* A wife, if she give her body to a stranger, though not with that opinion of love and respect which is only due to her husband, is yet an harlot, and the people who sware by *Iehovah*, and by *Malcome*, who worship *Iehovah*, and *Ieroboams* Calves, and those who worship the Image of an Ash-Tree, representing *Iehovah*, *Isa.*40.18. *Isa.* 46.6,7. did not give honour to *Malcom*, to the Calves, to the Images, *Sicut Iehovæ*, as to God. See *Roinalds* Answer. *But* (saith he) *We cannot worship God, but we must conceive some Image of God in our minde, are we therefore Idolaters, because in these* Images *we worship God?* and *Valent.* saith, and so doth the *Formalist* Lindsey say, *That* God *may be adored before the Sacrament all elements as* Images. *Ans.* We are not forbidden to adore God in the inward conception of minde, *Deut.*4. *Ye saw no manner of similitude, but not, yea thought no manner of thoughts of God.* 2. The internall image of God in the minde is the objective conception of God as conceived in the minde, there is no hazard of Idolatry there, for that Image is not adorable at all, because then it must be conceived by a new different Image, and that new different Image must be cognoscible by another new Image, and so *in infinitum*. The externall Image is both made an active object to represent God, and when we religiously bow to it, it is made an object passive, that is adored with God.

Lastly,

Lastly, If the Iews and heathen had adored their Images, as they were such creatures consecrated, and as essentially Gods, the Lord would not have rebuked them for making an Ash Tree the similitude of a God, as he doth, *Isa.*40.18. *Isa.*44.9,&c. And all that I said in the former question proveth the same. So that though Divine honour in the Act of kneeling before the elements be intended to Christ, yet because the elements are there as actuall signes, and Vicegerent Images of Christ, if we kneel to *Christ* Religiously through them, we give them divine honour, though we should intend to honour *Christ* Iesus only.

(a) *Concil. triden.* Sess. 25. *Statuimus imagines in templis habendas & retinendas ijsq; debitum honorem & veneration-em imperti-endam; non quod credatur esse aliqua* in his *divinitas, vel virtus propter quam sint colendæ: sed quoniam honos qui iis exhibetur, refertur ad Prototypa, quæ illa repræsentant, ut per imagines quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus & procumbimus, Christum adoremus & sanctos, quorum illas similitudinem gerunt.*

Sect. III.

Whether Papists and Formalists give that divine honour that is proper only to God and his son Iesus Christ *to* Images, *and the elements of Bread and Wine?*

I. *Con.* TO adore Images is to give worship to God before Images, or, in, or through the Images without any Faith of a Godhead, or divine power in the Image according to the Doctrine of the *Church of Rome.* I prove this out of their Councels. (a) The Councell of *Trent* saith, *Due honour and veneration is due to the* Images, *not because it is believed, that there is any Divinity and vertue in them, for the which they should be Worshipped; but because the honour given to them is referred to the samplar, which they represent; that by these* Images *which we kisse, and before which we uncover our head and bow down; we may adore Christ, and the Saints which these* Images *resembleth:* Hence 1. the Image doth but, as a memorative object, excite the affection to give honour to God, in, and through the Images; but 2. Let these words be examined, the Councell *denyeth any divinity to be in* Images, but if they mean no divinity really to be in Images, so they say nothing against us; for we do not ascribe to *Papists* that they teach there is a reall God-head in the Image, but that all that is really in it, is Wood, Gold, or Mettall, and so did the *Gentiles* believe their Images to be teaching books, *Hab.*2 9. *Ier.*10.8. *Deut.*4.19. *Isa.*40.18. & 46. 6,7. *Act.*17.29. and gold and silver; but say they, *What needed the Prophets to prove that gold and silver could not see, nor hear, nor deliver in time of trouble, reason would here convince them to be ten times*

Papists did of old adore before, or at the presence of the Image as a memorative signe, and yet were Idolaters.

times blinde, Who believed any such thing. *Anſ.* The Prophets do well to do ſo: Nor that the Heathen believed there was any Godhead in them formally, but becauſe they aſcribed actions to theſe images, that were due to living creatures, and made them to be ſuch as did ſee, hear, move, deliver; So *Iſaiah* proveth *Egypts horſes* not to be God, *but fleſh*, yet they did not believe there was a Godhead in the horſes, but *Conſequenter*, by good conſequence, when they laid that hope on the *horſe*, that they were to lay upon God, he had need to ſay *the horſe vvas fleſh and not God*: So when men give to theſe things, bowing of the body, and *ſay unto a ſtock, Thou art my Father*: God may prove the ſtock is not a living man, and hath no ſences, to convince them the more, that they can far leſſe be Gods Vicar; for a Vicar or Deputy creature repreſenting the living God, ſhould be ſuch as can do what God doth; elſe we ſhould put on it the honour due to God: But if the Councell mean, *They have no divinity in them, but by way of repreſentation*, becauſe they be *Vicaria dei ſigna*, ſignes reſembling the *Creator God*; Now if this be denyed, the images muſt be naked memorials before which people do adore God, as *Mirandula, Durandus* and others ſaid, and yet latter Papiſts ſay more of their own Images: But I would have it remembred, that there be two ſorts of deputed or Vicar-Images; ſome that do only ſignifie, as the darkneſſe of the Skie going before the morning light in the Eaſt, that doth nothing at all which the morning light doth, but nakedly ſignifieth that the Sun is riſing: There be other Depute ſignes that can exerciſe acts, which the ſamplar would do, if it were preſent, as the deputy is not a naked Vicar or depute ſigne of the King, for he doth not only ſignifie the *Kings* minde, but can do Royall Acts in the *Kings* name: Images are depute ſignes of God, of the firſt ſort, that do only rub the memory and underſtanding, and therefore deſerve no honour except the honour due to the means of worſhip, as the Bible, Sacraments, which deſerve not Adoration, but onely a Negative Reverence, or a not diſpiſing or contemptuous handling of them, Images being unlawfull meanes, and not Commanded of God, deſerve no Veneration at all; and though it be true, that the Ambaſſadour deſerve Princely Honour, for the Princes Place, whom he repreſenteth; yet he can act the perſon of the Prince, and is not a naked deputed

Two ſort of ſignes.

puted ſign, but Images are therefore convinced to be unlawfull deputies repreſenting (as Idolaters made them to be, Iſa. 40. 18. Iſa. 46. 6,7.) Becauſe they can do no acts at all, nor exerciſe any actions proper to the ſamplar, for *Pſal.* 115. *v.* 6. *They have mouths, but they ſpeak not, eyes they have, but they ſee not,* 7. *They have eares, but they hear not*; and therefore ſhould not be truſted in, as in means and deputed repreſentations of God, for which cauſe the Prophet inferreth ver. 8. *They that made them, are like unto them, ſo are every one that truſteth in them. ver.* 9. *O Iſrael truſt thou in the Lord.* Therefore Religious truſting in them is Idolatry: But the *Canon of Trent* ſaith this ſame of their Images, to wit, that there be no Godhead or vertue in them. 2. If the worſhip of λατρεία, the higher ſervice due to God, be given to Images, as I prove hereafter, then alſo ſome deity or Divine vertue; for Gods higheſt honour can no more be communicated to any, ſave to God, then the Godhead it ſelf; for a *Relative Godhead* is as due to ſtocks, as a relative worſhip. 3. If the *Tridentine Canoniſts* will have divine Adoration given to God *Coram imaginibus, before Images*, or at their preſence, as only memorative ſignes, & active objects exciting us to worſhip God, then is our Theſis proved: But if they mean that God is Adored, *Coram imaginibus, before images*, as not only memorative and active objects, but alſo before them as paſſive objects, that are compartners under God of ſome divine adoration; then I ſay 1. they contradicted themſelves, for Gods higheſt honour called λατρεία, can not be given to them but by a figure, becauſe they are Gods, & have divinity in them only by a figure, and not really: for *Suarez* & *Vaſquez* denieth that we can fix our hope and faith in Images, or make prayers to them, *Niſi modo figurativo & tropo duriore*, by a figure, and a hard troop, and moſt improperly, and by that ſame reaſon muſt be given to ſtocks and ſtones moſt improperly, and that is, men do religiouſly bow before them, as before memorative objects. 2. *Gabriel* (b) *Vaſquez* ſaith well, *There can be no footſtep of holineſſe in the image, beſide the excellency of the ſamplar, nor any divine vertue wherefore it ſhould be worſhipped; for there is nothing in the*

(b) *Vaſquez* tom. 1. in 3. art. 3. diſ. 108. cap. 8.

In imagine præter ipſius prototypi excellentiam non poteſt eſſe aliqua virtus, cui cultus debeatur: eſt enim in imagine ſolum irrationale & inanimatum excellentiæ & ſanctitatis exemplar, cui homo nequit digne ſeſe ſubmittere Adoratione.

image

image of it self, but that which is senseless, and lifeless, and spiritless and no man can in a Religious way submit himself to such a creature? Hence it must be a naked memorative sign, and therefore the kissing of the Image, though Physically it be reall, and not Metaphysicall, yet moral it is not propper, seeing all religious affection in that kissing is transferred to God. And we know *Vasquez* alloweth, that every thing, as it is a being, and resembleth God the first being, is to be Adored, and so stones,---Frogs, the Devil, *Judas* lips that kissed Christ, are to be Adored.

So their seventh pretended Synod (c) saith, *That the Honour due to God is not to be given to images, according to our faith, only at the beholding of Pictures We are put in minde of the samplar:* And the same saith Mr. *Lindesey*, is the way of Adoring God in the Sacrament. But so the Gentiles, as saith (d) *Arnobius*, and (e) *Lactantius, yea, and the Apostle* (f) Paul saith *Adored images*; yea, and God would (g) not forbid similitudes of God to be Adored, except he did teach that the heathen Idolaters worshipped similitudes, and so the Papists in that vulgar verse said, they Adored not the Images, but the thing signified by the Images.

Effigiem Christi dum transis, semper Adora:
Non tamen effigiem, sed quod designat, Honora.

Let me adde these reasons to prove they cannot Adore the Image, but as a memorative sign: 1. The Image and the elements in any consideration, either as creatures, or as the honourable act of representation is put upon them, are but creatures; for the act of representation is a temporary Godhead, and maketh them but Time-Gods; *Ergo*, they cannot be Adored. 2. If there be two Adorations here, one given to God, and another to the Image, and if both be divine honour, there must be two collaterall Gods; if Adoration prove Christ to be God, two divine honours put upon things, one upon God, and another upon the Creature; there must be

(c) 7. *Synodus, Quo scilicet per hanc imaginum picturarum inspectionem, omnes qui contemplantur, ad prototyporum memoriam & desiderium veniant, illisque Adorationem honorariam exhibeant, non secundum fidem nostram, veram latriam.*

(d) *Arnobius* lib. 6. *Gentes Adorabant statuas, non quod æs, aurum, argentum & similes statuarum materiæ dij sint, sed quod eorum, quæ alias invisibiles sunt, præsentia per simulachra exhibeatur.* (e) *Lactantius*, de institut. ad Constantium. lib. 2. cap. 2. *Non ipsa (inquiunt Gentes) simulachra timemus, sed ea ad quorum imaginem facta, & quorum nominibus consecrata sunt. Resp. Lactantius nempe ideo timetis quod eos in cælis esse Arbitramini, cur igitur oculos in cælum non tollitis? Cur ad parietes ligna & lapides potius, quam eò spectatis, ubi eos esse creditis.* (f) *Act*, 17. 29. (g) *Deut.* 4. 15. *Isa.* 40. 18. & 46. 6, 7, 8, 9.

two

two Gods, or then the Creature remaining a Creature, must have Communion with Gods high honour, which is Idolatry. 3. Images and elements are either worshipped for themselves, or for some other thing; if for themselves, they are God, for only God for himself is worshipped with Divine honour; if for God they be worshipped, then it is an inferiotr, and improper worship, and therefore they must be worshipped as memorative objects. 4. Images and elements, if they partake of externall worship proper to God: Why may not Sacrifices and Incense be offered unto them, and faith and hope fixed on Images? They do not partake of internall worship: for as *Vasquez* saith well, inward worship consisteth in *Apprehensione primi principii, & in motu ad illud; in apprehension of the first Author and Creator of all things, and in the Wills motion toward it.* But this apprehension cannot be put upon Images or elements, therefore they be here significant objects only.

So their second Councell (h) of *Nice*, as *Epiphanius* a Deacon, in name of the Synod saith, *Images were present before the kneelers, as our elements are, only as memorative objects.* 2. That the singular affection of Adoring, was bounded only upon God: And (i) *Concilium Senonense* saith, *Images are to be Adored, not because there is any Godhead in them, but for the memory of the samplar*: And (k) *Concilium Moguntinum, Images are not propounded that we should worship them, but that we may call to minde the things which we are to worship.* If therefore we Adore God at the presence of the elements, as memorative signes we do Adore the elements; but if the kneeler direct all his worship before the elements, to Christ up at the right hand of the Father: Why then (as *Lactantius* said well to the *Gentiles*) do they not turn away their senses and eyes off the elements? For Christ is not substantially inclosed in them, and lift them up toward heaven, where they believe Christ to be? But in so doing the elements should not be received as Sacraments, for in the act of receiving we are to fixe our souls upon the visible elements: If the *Athenians* did believe the *golden image*, *Act.* 17.29.

(h) *Concilium Nicen. 2. Quod si in recordationem atque memoriam, ita quod salutari quâdam affectione in ipsa prototypa ferebantur (Catholici) salutaverint & honorificè Adoraverint imagines, non tamen ob id illis latreiam exhibuerunt, aut Divinam Venerationem adscripserunt, absit hæc calumnia.* (i) *Concilium Senonense* Cap. 14. *Definit imagines debere adorari non quia in illis aliquid numinis creditur inesse, sed ob recordationem exemplaris.* (k) *Concilium Mogunt.* Cap. 41. *Pastores nostri populum accurate moneant imagines non ad id proponi, ut adoremus aut colamus eas, sed ut quod adorare & colere aut quarum rerum utiliter,-- meminisse debemus, per imagines recordemur.*

was essentially God, and kneeled to it as to God; *Paul* did in vain rebuke them for believing that the *Godhead* was like silver or gold; and if the men of *Lystra* believed the shapes of men, and the likeness of men to be essentially God, and in that respect gave the honour of Sacrificing due to God, to these shapes; then the Scripture in vain should bring these men of *Lystra* in, as putting a difference betwixt the shapes of men, and the Godhead of *Jupiter* and *Mercurius*, to which they were about to give Divine Sacrifice. And if *Formalists* kneel before the elements, and give a transitive glory to Christ through them, they are in the same sense Idolaters that the Gentiles were. So the *Councel of Moguntine*, (l) and *Alphonsus de Castro* (m) *deny that they Adore the letters of the Name* (*Jesus*) *drawn with base ink, or the Tree of the Crosse; but they Adore the signified thing:* Yea, saith (n) *Waldensis, He that beholdeth the image, almost forgetteth the image, while as he is ravished with the thing signified: as many see a man clothed, and yet being asked, they cannot declare the colour of his clothes, the minde is so much set upon the man: Yea, the Adorer may hate the painted image of Christ, because the rude ignorance of the painter, when he Adoreth Christ in the same image, though he may love some morall representation in it.* This Doctrine is taught by (o) *Gregorius*; and by (p) *Adrianus*, and (q) approved by a Councel at *Rome* under *Stephanus* the third.

(l) *Concil. Mogunt.* ib. Sect. 2. *Codicem oculis perlustrans, cum ad venerabile & tremendum nomen* Iesu *devenerit, caput aperit, inclinatur, & suspirans in cælum oculos attolit, & ob id omni reprehensione & Idolatriæ suspicione careat; siquidem non literas quæ vili atramento pinguntur, honorat, sed cogitatione & veneratione mentis suæ ad eum honorandum & venerandum rapitur, cujus memoriam hæ literæ ei suggerunt.* (m) *Alphons. de Castro hæres.* 1. *denique adoratio ipsa, et si coram cruce fit, meus tamen nostra ad id solum refertur quod crux ipsa repræsentat.* (n) *Thom. Waldens.* de sacram. tom. 3. cap. 156. nu. 6. (o) *Grego.* lib. 7. Epist. ad Secund. q. 53. (p) *Adrianus*, de imaginibus, cap. 12. (q) *Concilium Romanum sub Stephano* 3. *Et nos quidem non quasi ante Divinitatem, ante illam* (imaginem aut elementa Sacramentalia) *prosternimur, sed illam adoramus, quem per imaginem natum, passum, aut in throno sedentem recordamur.* (r) *Suarez*, Tom 3. in 1. disp. 54. Sect. 4.

II. *Conclusion.* Grosser Papists go a subtiler way to work, and do avouch that the very *Latreia* and supream worship that is proper to God, is given to the Image.

Though the creature saith (r) *Suarez cannot*, Primo, & per se, *principally, kindly, and of it self be worshipped or adored with Latreia, the supream worship due to God, yet it may be co-adored, with the same honour that is given to Christ, as is the Kings purple Robe:* So the first Distinction is of Adoration and co-Adoration, or Adoration kinde-

ly,

ly, and by it self, and Adoration with another. *Henriquez*(*f*) saith, *It is a fault that it is not preached to the people, that the image of Christ is to be adored with supream Worship called Latreia* (*t*). Crabrera saith, *many Schoolmen are of this mind*; and so doth(w) *Azorius* (*x*) *Archangelus Rubeo* (*y*) *Iacobus de Graphiis, Let us Worship* (saith he) *every Image with that same Worship, with which we Worship the samplar*: That is, let us bestow the worship highest of Latreia, upon the Image of *God* and *Christ*, and the signe of the Crosse, as it bringeth us in minde of Christs suffering: The second distinction is, that the Image is truly properly adored, as the materiall object no lesse then the samplar: Hence they reprove *Durandus*, *Picus Mirandula*, *Hulcot*, and others, who say that Images are improperly adored, & (*a*) *Raphael de la Torres* answering to that of *Durandus* and *Mirandula*, *That Images are adored by accident, in respect that before them, and at their naked presence, as before memorative objects, we adore God and Christ* (saith he) (*are adored by accident*) *is thus to be understood, Images are adored*, Ratione Alterius, *by reason of another*, Vel per aliud, *by another thing, but this argueth not that Images are improperly adored, hereby onely is denyed that there is any adoration of the proper excellency of the thing adored*. Hence he would say that the borrowed honour of Adoration given to the Image is truly and properly the Adoration that is due to God, but it is given to the Image in reference to God, and not for any inherent Excellency that is in the Image: *For* (saith he) *If we do not properly adore the Image, we do but exercise the materiall action of kissing and kneeling to the image, without any internall affection of submission to the Samplar*: He addeth that it is enough that the intention of submission is referred to the samplar, and the external Adoration to the Image, *for if any shall* (saith he) *kisse the earth* (*as the rude multitude in some place doth*) *upon an intention of inward submission of heart to God*, Nequaquam vere & proprie adorat terram, *he doth not truly and properly adore the earth, but only he exerciseth a materiall action*

(*f*) *Henriquez* sum. Theolog. Moral. lib. 8. cap. 32. *Male quidam negant prædicandum populo, quod imago Christi sit adoranda. Latreia.*

(*t*) *Cabrera*, in 3. pag. Thom. q. 25. Art. 3. disp. 3.

(*w*) *Azorius* instit. Moral. to. 1. l. 9. c. 60.

(*x*) *Archangel. Rubeo* in 3. sent. d. 9.

(*y*) *Jacob de Graphijs*, Decisio. aur. p. i. l. 2. cap. 2. num. 15. *Vnamquanque imaginem, eodem cultu, quo illum cujus est imago, vereremur:*

(*a*) *Raphael de la Torres*, sum. Theolog. de relig. to. 1. in 22. q. 84. art. 2. disp. 5. q. 94. dub. 5. *Respondetur modus iste dicendi* (*per accidens adorantur*) *sic debet intelligi, idest per aliud, vel* (*quod idem est*) *ratione alterius; hoc autem non arguit improprietatem adorationis, sed negat adorationem excellentiæ proprie & residentis in re adorata; sic adoratur humanitas Christi.* See also *Bellarm.* de imag. c. 21. c. 25. *Neque dicendum eas impropre venerandas esse, quia quod non dicitur nisi improprie, simpliciter negari potest.*

Diverse vasions of Papists touching the worshipping of images.

of *kissing toward the earth*: But I answer, all this is vanity, for such a one worshippeth the earth, but referreth the internall submission to God, and all this, is to say the Image doth truly partake of the Religious honour (*Latreia*) due to God only.

A third distinction is here, of (*b*) *Gabriel Biel* on the Canon of the Masse, *In the Adoring of images* (saith he) *and of other things which are adored by accident, though there be an externall act of bowing both to the images and the samplar, yet there be two internall acts which are different, whereof one is terminated and bounded upon the image, not absolutely as it is such a materiall thing of stone, or mettall, but as it is an image:* This is an acknowledgement whereby I esteem the Image a thing ordained to represent *Christ*, or a complacency whereby I rest on such a thing, as to be honoured for *Christ*, and the other is a recognition, and acknowledgement immediatly terminated and bounded upon the samplar, whereby it is acknowledged to be the chiefest good. *But the truth is, Religious geniculation before the image, or at the presence of the image* (saith (c) *Durandus*) *as if the samplar were there present, is one and the same adoration given to the image and the samplar*; and all that (*d*) *Gregorius de Valentia* saith against this, is, that *Durandus minus circumspectè locutus, he spake not so warily, as need were*: And so did their (*e*) seventh pretended synod speak, as (*f*) *Leontius* expoundeth them, *Non liquorum aut colorum naturam adoro, absit*, and (*g*) *Vasquez* saith, *They displease some in so speaking, but they mean well*: They meant all that which our *Formalists* do; *and there is no discord* (saith (*h*) *Gabriel Biel*) in re, *in the matter it self*; for both say; 1. that the creature should not be adored with the highest honour (*Lateria*) of it self, as if it were the object of Adoration: 2. Both teach that the minde and affection is carried toward the samplar, which is adored: 3. Both mean that the adorer exerciseth some act upon the image, as it representeth the samplar, only the diversity is, if this act terminated on the Image, should be called an adoring of the Image; and all these three *Formalists* do to the elements in the supper: Hence I require of the *Formalists*, one difference betwixt the objective presence of the elements before the kneeler, in the act of receiving, and the objective presence of the *Heathens* image of God, *Isa.* 40.

(b) *Gabriel Biel* in can. missæ. lect. 49. fol. 92.

(c) *Duran.* lib. 3. dist. 9. q. 2. n. 10. *Sed quia loquendum est ut plures, ideo commune dictum sic exponendum est, quod pro tanto dicitur imago sub ratione imaginis adorari eadem adoratione cum re, cujus est imago, quia ad præsentiã imaginis seu signi fit rememoratio rei, quam rememoratam adoramus, eadem adoratione ac si præsens esset in se, et ideo concedi potest quod signa et imagines adorantur.*

(d) *Greg.* 19. *de Valen.* to. 3. dis. 6. q. 11. de idol pun. 6. [*e*] *Sept.* Syn. ar. 14. [*f*] *Leon.* lib. 5. Apol. Syn. 7. ar. 14. [*g*] *Vasq.* in 3. q. 25. ar. 3. dis. 106. c. 1. [*h*] *G. Biel* in can. mis. lect. 49. fol. 94.

18. & 46:6,7,8. and the Papists image of dumb wood, and blinde stone: Mr. *Lindsey* answered me once in a conference, *That the elements were present as the Ordinances of God, but the Popish and Heathen images as the inventions of men.* I replied to him, That is no answer: for images and elements (I know) do differ, *Physicâ specie*; The Sun adored by *Persians*, and *Satan* by *Indians* differ. *Satan* and the Sun, are not *Ejusdem speciei*, of that same nature, but it is idolatry to worship either; images and bread in the kind of means of worship differ, but, as touching the objective presence before the kneeler kneeling to these, there is no difference: as 1. To memorative objects: 2. As to objects vicarious and standing in the room of Christ: 3. At their presence and through them God is adored. (*i*) *Suarez*, is not content with the doctrine of *Durandus* here, *By this, images are* (saith he) *but occasions*, Vel signa excitantia hominem ad prototypum adorandum, non vero res quæ adorantur, *or signes moving the man to adore the samplar, but they are not things adored: for* (saith he) *the man, who seeing a beautifull creature, ariseth in his minde to the consideration of the Creator, and therefore praiseth and loveth the Creator, cannot be truly said to praise and love that fair creature, though the presence of that creature have stirred up the love of the Creator, and by this means images are reserved only for memory.* Thus he will have images adored with the same worship that is given to God: But I answer: 1. if he shall kisse that creature and direct Religious bowing toward it, and and through that external Religious act, convey his worship to God, and give no other externall adoration and signe of heart submission to God, then that which is tyed and alligated of purpose to that fair creature, as *Papists* and *Jews* did of old, who kissed the *calves*, and fell down before the images, as *Isa.*44.17. which yet were but memorials of *Iehovah* teaching them of *Iehovah*, *Esa.* 40.18. *Esa.* 46.6,7. *Hab.*2.18,19. Such a one should also worship that fair creature: Our *Formalists* do not make the elements memorative signes representing Christ, for that they have by divine institution, but upon that ground they kneel before them, and tie, by the Churches Commandment, the externall Religious bowing toward them, *and that* (saith the act of our new Assembly at *Perth*) *in reverence of God, and in due regard* (Religious regard they must mean) *of so divine a mystery, and in remembrance of so mysticall a union:*

[*i*] *Suarez* tom.1. in 3.quest.25 art.3.disp. 53. Sect.3. *Qui visa pulchræ creaturæ specie animo insurgit ad considerationem creatoris, & illum laudat aediligit, non potest vere dici laudare ac diligere creaturam, etiam si præsentia creaturæ excitaverit amorem creatoris; ideoque tantum (sic) propter memoriam retinendæ imagines.* *Suarez* is not content at the hungry and unproper expressions of *Durandus*, *Mirandula*, *Hulcot*.

2. God

2. God hath no other externall bowing made to him in the act of receiving, then is made before these elements, *in due regard of so divine a mystery, and because of so mysticall union*; the union is reall, whether it be by *consubstantiation*, or *transubstantiation*, they will not define, the Lord *Iesus* is present in the elements, in a more reall and spirituall manner, then he is in any groundlesse image of mettall or wood; and therefore the image and elements do most really partake even by *Durandus* and *Hulcot*, and *Mirandula* their minde of that worship of (*Latreia*) due to God; only *Durandus* (as *Vasquez*, and *Gregor. Valent.* say) *Spake not so warily*, but not so grossely, as to say, *What ever is given to God, is given to the image:* 2. It is not in the Adorers power that kneeling should be a signe of lesse worship, as referred to the image, and of greater, as referred to God; for the same materiall kissing, and Religious Prostration, which would immediatly be conveyed to Christ, if he were in person present in the image and elements, is done to the image and elements, and Religious kissing, and Religious kneeling signifieth internall divine submission of heart to God, as the first author of all, and the last end, not by mans will, but by divine institution. 3. Kneeling to God is a protestation (saith (*k*) *Gregor, de Valent.*) *That We are willing to raise an opinion of excellency in God, as this excellency is in some manner, and relatively in the image.* If therefore kneeling of its own nature, without any act of mans will, or the Churches institution, wanting Gods Word, do conciliate an opinion of excellency; to whomsoever kneeling is directed, in this it must conciliate the same opinion: if then it it be given to Images and elements, it must be a protestation that we are willing to conciliate an opinion of Divine excellency in these lifelesse creatures, which is all we give to God by kneeling. 4. It is not enough that *Valentia* saith, *This honour belongeth to Christ, in so far as it concili-*

[*k*] *Gregor. de Valent.* to. 3. disp. 6. q. 11. de idolat. punct. 6. *Cum autem per idem officium & motum animi veré etiam dicimus honorem exhiberi imagini, verbo, illi exhiberi, hoc sub est, nos Prototypon ex imagine cogitantes, coram ipsâ actionem honorificam proinde ac si prototypon similiter esset præsens, exercentes, velle prototypi excellentia protestari, adcoque de ipso excitare opinionem excellentem, ut est quodammodo, nimirum relative in imagine suâ.*

What need we dispute? to give that externall knee-worship to bread, which we would give to Christ substantially and personally present, is to adore bread.

ateth

ateth to Christ the honour due only to God, and is expressed by kneeling, & it belongeth to the images so, as Coram, & in illis, *before, and in them this opinion is conciliated to Christ*: But if the image be God only *representatively*, and *by way of signification*, then is it not God of it self and really, *Quod est tale tantum significativè, non est tale per se, & realiter*, as a painted man is not of it self, and really a man; the word (*Iesus*) as written with base ink, is not infinite *Iesus, the mighty God, the Prince of Peace*, really, but only in meer signification: therefore to give Gods honour and externall Religious bowing (which essentially doth note the highest excellency of God) to them, is Idolatry: It is a vain thing to say, *The Ambassadour is not really the King; yet the reall honour due to the King, is done to him.* I Answer, where the King declareth that it is his will, that his Ambassadour be really honoured as himself; this is not the giving of the Kings glory to another against his will: But here expresly contrary to that (*Thou shalt not bow down to them*) expounded especially of similitudes, *Deut.* 4. 15. *Ye saw no manner of similitude.* The glory of Religious bowing contrary to Gods will, (*Who will not give his glory to another*) is given to images, and to Bread. 2. It redoundeth kindely to the King, who is absent, and to be obeyed in his absence, that His Vicegerent and Deputy be honoured as himself, and presupposeth an infirmity in the King, that he cannot be in many places to receive immediately the honour due to him, and therefore will have that due paid to himself, mediately, by the honoured person of a Deputy. God infinite is in all places, to receive immediately the pay of Religious knee-honour, and it dishonoureth God to have his glory laid down in the hand of any creature; as it dishonoureth the Husband that his wife give her body to another, representing his person: For this cause (*l*) *Bernardus Puiol* saith, *Images are properly to be Adored*, contrary to that which *Durandus* saith: And (m) *Azorius* saith, *It is the common opinion that Images are to be worshipped with* (*Latreia*) *the highest honour due to God: So* (saith he) *Thomas, Alexander, Bonaventura, Richardus, Albertus, Paludanus, Alman, Marsilius, Capreolus, Cajetanus, & cæteri juniores sic sentiunt.*

The fourth expression of wit, is this distinction of (*n*) *Vasquez*, *That that internall submission to God, as to the Creator and chief God, is due to God only; and that the image, seeing it is a Creature, is not capable*

(l) *Bernar. Puiol.* de ador. disp. 3. Sect. 7. *Quarto colligitur contra Durandum ipsas imagines proprie adorari.*

(m) *Azor.* instit. moral. tom. 1. lib. 9. c. 6. 4. Distin.

(n) *Vasquez* ut supr. dis. 108. Per totum.

capable of that high honour. But the externall act of kissing and kneeling, he will have due to the image, for the excellency of the Samplar. And so he denyeth contrary to *Suarez*, That the image separated from the Samplar, or the humanity of Christ separated from Divinity, can be Adored: But if externall Adoration may be given to images; so also internall submission: (*Thou shalt not bow down to them*) Religiously it is expounded in the second Commandment, (*Thou shalt not Worship them.*) It is grosseneſse in *Vasquez* to say, *The Worshipping of images was forbidden the Iews in the second Commandment, as a Ceremoniall inhibition, because of the Iews propension to idolatry*: But *Act.*17.29. *Paul* expoundeth the second Commandment, *Forbidding the similitude of God*: And the *Athenians* were not under the Law of Ceremonies. Ioannes (o) *de Lugo* saith, *This is a probable opinion*: But it is clear, *Cornelius* a devout man, one who feared and worshipped God, whose Prayers were heard in heaven for Christs sake, knew that *Peter* was a man which lodged in the house of *Simon a Tanner*; yet his Religious externall bowing (though he knew *Peter* was not God, but a Divine man resembling God) by *Peter* is rebuked as idolatry, *Act.*10. v. 25,26. I cannot help Ioan. (p) *de Lugo*, to say, *That Peter forbade Cornelius to Worship him, not because it was a sin, but for modesties cause.* But 1. *Peters* Argument striketh against idolatry, *ver.* 26. (*Stand up*, (he forbiddeth Religious kneeling) *for I my self also a man*) The very Argument that *Paul and Barnabas* useth, *Act.* 14. *ver.* 15. *We also are men &c.* and used against the idolatry of *Lystra*, expressly condemned in that place: And the Angels Argument against the idolatry of Iohn, *Rev.* 19. 10. *I am thy fellow servant, Worship God*; *Ergo*, externall Religious bowing should not be given to any, save to God. 2. *Peter* and the *Angel* should have opened the Jesuits and Formalists distinction, if worshipping of Saints and dumbe images be worshipping of God, and the honour principally of inward acknowledgment of the Supremacy and Soveraignty of God, be intended, in bowing to images, and modesty should not forbid honouring of God: And whereas Ioannes *de Lugo* saith, *Iohn was forbidden to Worship the Angel, to signifie that our nature in Christ was advanced to a dignity above the Angels.* But 1. then it is unlawfull to any to worship Angels. 2. Nor is it Lawfull to give the *Virgine Mary* Divine worship, as *Suarez* saith:

(o) *Joannes de Lugo*, de myst. incar. disp. 34. Sect. 2. n. 29.

(p) Ibid. disp. 35. Sect. 1. n. 6.

Joannes de Lugo, ibid.

1. *For*

1. *For her excellency in touching Christ.* 2. *For her Grace and Sanctity.* 3. *For her mothers place in bearing Christ*; becauſe her nature in Chriſt is not exalted above the nature of other believers, for the nature common to all believers, and *Eadem ſpecie*, was aſſumed by Chriſt. 3. The *Angel* ſaith, (*Worſhip God*) he therefore believed the Worſhipping of *Angels* was not the Worſhipping of *God*. All theſe fight againſt *Religious bowing* before the elements, *in due regard of ſo Divine myſteries*: the Bread would ſay (if it could ſpeak) *See thou do it not, for* I *alſo am a Creature.*

The fifth trick of wit, is a diſtinction of (*q*) *Suarez*, *That one and the ſame act of Adoration may be given, and is given in externall Worſhip to the image and to God, but in reference to God, it is* Latreia, *the high Honouring of God, and in reference to the image, it is an inferior Veneration*: So do our Formaliſts ſay, as (*r*) *Burges* ſaith, *Adoration and Veneration differ not but by mens will; and if it be lawfull to Adore God before the Ark,* (*s*) *Why not at the Sacrament? The Bread and the Wine are Chriſt ſignificative,* (*as the Ark had the title of* Iehovah) *by occaſion of the elements, not as they are, but as they ſignify*; *we may tender a knee-worſhip, not at all to them, but only to God or Chriſt.* And again, (*t*) he holdeth it lawfull to Adore the elements, *but then Adoration as given to the elements, is Veneration, and Adoration in a large ſence,* 1 Chron. 29. 20. *The people Worſhipped God and the King*: *The outward Adoration was one, as the word by which it is expreſſed was one*; *but the Religious and Civill worſhip were diſtinct in the minde and intention of the worſhippers. Edward*, the 6. Book (*w*) ſaith, *Kneeling is to eſchew prophaning of the Sacrament.* Oppoſit to prophaning is externall Religious honouring, expreſſed by kneeling, and that is Adoring. Hence one and that ſame Adoration and externall bowing, is given to Bread and to Chriſt; but the minde and will of the Adorer maketh the ſame act in reference to Chriſt, Adoration, or *Latreia*, of the higheſt degree of honour; but in reference to the Bread, lawfull Veneration of an inferior nature. Anſwer 1. If it were poſſible that the Wife could tranſmit her body in the act of Harlotry, by, or through a ſtrange Lover to her Husband, her will and minde might change Adultery; if ſhe ſaith, ſhe giveth her body to a ſtranger, but in her minde and will intendeth to bring forth children to her own Husband: So if divers acts of the minde, make Religious

5. Diſtin.

(*q*) *Suarez*, part. 3. to. 1. diſp. 54. Sect. 3. *Actus* [*Adorandi*] *reſpectu prototypi eſt propric Latreia &c. Reſpectu vero imaginis eſt inferior Venecratio.*

(*r*) *Burges*, Lawfulnes of kneeling cap. 8. p. 14, 15.

(*ſ*) p. 34, 35.

(*t*) p. 84, 85.

(*w*) *Edward*, 6. book of Engl. ſerv. rubr. 5.

kneeling to a ſtock or Bread lawfull, if one ſhould Adore the man *Iudas* as a memoriall of Chriſt, his intention of will might ſave his Soul; if he ſay, *I give one and the ſame externall worſhip to* Iudas *and to Chriſt*: Or if *Cornelius* ſhould ſay, *I give one and the ſame knee-worſhip, to* Peter *and to Chriſt*; *but in my intention they be far different*: For I Worſhip *Iudas* and *Peter* in that act with Civill homage Commanded in the fifth Commandment, as they be *Chriſts Apoſtles*, and repreſent him; but in that ſame I Worſhip Chriſt with the higheſt honour, called *Latreia: Vaſquez* and *Burges* make them one externall Worſhip. The three Children might have kneeled to the Image of *Nebuchadnezzer*, for their minde and will (as *Formaliſts* ſay) might have put another ſignification of honouring the Lord Iehovah, upon their knee-worſhip; and externall kneeling could not have been denyed to the Lord Iehovah; and ſo the three Children ſhould not have given Divine honour and knee-glory to the Image, and they were fooles who did hazard their bodies to the fire: But wiſemen think, if they had given knee-worſhip (what ever their heart thought) they ſhould have obeyed the *King*, yet they profeſſe diſobedience, *Dan.* 3. 18. *We will not worſhip thy graven image.* 2. Neither think we the *Athenians* gave that ſame honour to the ſimilitude *Act.* 17.29. of God, that they gave to the *God that Paul Preached, who made Heaven and earth, v.* 23, 24. Yet in giving Worſhip externall to both, they were Idolaters, ver. 29. Nor did the men of *Lyſtra* give the ſame heart-honour to the Deities of *Iupiter* and *Mercury*, which they gave to the ſhapes of men; yet are they Idolaters in that. 3. Mr. *Burges* ſaith, Iſrael 1 *Chron.* 29.20. in one and the ſame act (externall) Worſhipped *God and the King, becauſe one and the ſame word expreſſeth honour* both to God and the King. But how ſhall we call that act? Civill, or Religious, or mixt? and did they tranſmit *Latreia*, divine honour through the *King* to *God*? he hath a Metaphyſicall faith who beleeveth ſuch dreames, becauſe one word is uſed to expreſſe both the worſhipping of *God and the King*, therefore it was one externall act of worſhipping, and differenced in the minde and intention of the worſhippers; the conſequence is moſt weake, 1 *Sam.* 12. 18. *All the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel, Prov.* 24. 21. *My ſon, feare the Lord and the King*, is it one manner of feare really, that is both religious to *God*, and to *Samuel*, and to the Lord, and the

King,

King, becauſe one word expreſſeth both? I ſee not but one & the ſame action of bowing may be made to God, to Chriſt, to the water in Baptiſme, to the Bible, to the Sun and Moon, and we might kneel and Adore a Toad, a ſtraw, and Satan, as they repreſent Gods wiſdom and power, and through that ſame externall knee-worſhip alſo Adore God: What, may we not then Religiouſly Adore all things and Creatures, as they repreſent God the firſt being.

Preſentemq; refert qualibet herba Deum. A man may Adore himſelf, his own hands, his legs, his Mothers Wombe that bare him, &c.

As for Adoring of the Ark and foot-ſtool of God: 1. Ioan. (x) *Giſenius*, a Lutheran ſaith, *The* Iews *had precept and promiſe to Worſhip* God *before the Ark, we have no Command to tye externall Adoration to any place or Creature.* 2. (y) *Didoclavius* ſaith, *It is lawfull to Adore* God *before the Ark, and the Symboles of his immediate preſence, becauſe* God *is there to receive his own Worſhip himſelf, by an immediate indwelling preſence: For* ſaith (z) Mr. *Weames*,

(x) *Ioan. Giſenius in ſuo Patiſmo*, diſp. 25. n. 40.

(y) *Didocl.* in Altari damaſc. *Hoſpinianus Arca non eſt habita pro deo vivente,---nec propterea adorata.* So anſwereth *Molinæus* in his buckler of faith of Images, *Sect.* 118. and *Fran. Whites* way to the Church, *Cap.* 9. *pag.* 3.

de originc feſtorum Chriſtian. contra. Gretſer. Profeſto corporis Chriſti, fol: 94. 7.

(z) *Weames* 3. Volumn of the Ceremon. Law, *Cap.* 3. *pag.* 12.

He appeared in glory above the Ark, betwixt the Cherubims, and it was a type of Chriſt who dvvelt in our fleſh; but it is not lavvfull to Worſhip him, before the Symboles of his grace. 3. The Ark was a type *in the act of teaching*, we grant; but that it was *in the act of Adoring*, God who was immediately preſent, and a Symboll Vicegerent of God, we reade not. There is no need of mediate ſignes, where God is immediately preſent, and Adored as he was in the Ark; they were to fixe both ſenſes and thoughts immediately upon God. 4. They were to worſhip, not the Ark, but the precept is, *& incurvate vos ſcabello, Worſhip tovvard the Ark.* (a) *Arias Mont.* turneth it, *Worſhip to the Ark.* The Greek Fathers of the *ſecond Niceu.* Councel, ignorant of the Hebrew Tongue, would have the Lord Commanding to Adore his foot-ſtool; whereas the Particle (ל) is a note of the Dative caſe, and often it ſignifieth motion to a thing, or at a place, ל מין *ad dextram*, and doth not abſolutely ſignifie the accuſative caſe. (b) *Muſculus ad Scabellum*,

The place (worſhip at his foot-ſtool) diſcuſſed.

(a) *Arias Montanus*: תשתחוו ליהוה להדום

(b) *Muſculus.*

(c) *Calvine* comment. in *Psal.* 99. 5.

(d) *Junius*, Annotation ibid.

Lyranus adorandam Deum aute aream, non ipsam arcam.

Tylenus in syntag nat. de preca. disp. 49. th. 2. nu. 29. particula. 9.

Notat idem quod versus. Vatablus adorate ad scabellum, i. e. in templo ante arcam.

(e) *Gratian* de conser. dist. 1. cap. 68.

Prayer may as lawfully be given to the Creature as Adoration. There is a Prayer made to the image of the face of *Jesus* written in linnen,

bellum, he maketh it the Ark of the Testament. *Calvine*, (c) the Temple. *Iunius*, (d) maketh it well to signifie the measure of bowing, bow to the foot-stool, or ground, or pavement of the Temple where the Lords feet are, as he sate on the Cherubims, 1 *Chron.* 28. 1. For there is no ground for Adoring the Ark; but the words are to be read, *Exalt the Lord our God, and bow your selves*, (to wit, to Iehovah, who sheweth himself, or dwelleth at his foot-stool) *that is, betwixt the Cherubims*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 1. For the word להדם *at his foot-stool*, is not constructed with the Verb, השתחוו *incurvate vos*: Jesuits and Formalists, devised that construction, but it is to be constructed with the word, יהוה which is to be repeated from the former part of the verse, *Bow your selves to Jehovah who dwelleth in the Ark, or in the Temple*: A familiar eleipsis to the Hebrews, *Psal.* 5. 8. *I will bow my self* (to the Iehovah dwelling) *in the Temple of thy holinesse*, as we are taught, *Our Father which art in Heaven*: So להדם and it is a description of God from the place where he dwelt, and exhibited his presence to his rude people. 4. It is ignorance in *Burges* to prove God may be Adored in the elements, *because they are as excellent Symbols of Gods presence as the Ark*: for created excellency is no ground of Adoring the elements, except it be a Godhead, and uncreated excellency: We condemne Pope (e) *Anastasius*, who directeth Reverend bowing at the hearing of the Gospel, and not of the Epistles, as if the Gospel were holier then the Epistles.

But if Adoration may be given to the elements, because knee-worship signifieth according to humane institution, and mans will, and are taken from customes of men, and so doth signifie lesse honour then is due to God: Let me be resolved of this doubt, words of Prayer signifie according to mens institution and their will, no lesse then Religious gestures do, and we may say to a stock, (*Thou art my Father*) and it is in our will that (*Father*) signifie a representative Father, not an infinite and Independent Father, such as God only is.

And if the image in externall kneeling, be Adored *Per aliud*, or co-adored with the Samplar, because it is one with the Samplar; Why may we not pray to the image, and fixe our faith and hope on

Salve Sancta facies nostri redemptoris salve vultus domini imago beata,---nos deduc ad propria ô felix figura, ad videndum faciem quæ est Christi pura.

the

the image and elements by co-adoration, or in relative praying and trusting in them? Yet (f) *the Fathers of Trent* for shame deny that we should pray to images, and put our trust in them: yet do Formalists turn the enunciative words of Christ (*This is my body*) in an optative mood, and a Prayer, *The body and blood of Christ* (they mean the elements in their hands) *preserve thee to eternall life*: And we are not ignorant, that faith and hope are ascribed to the Crosse, and this sung in the *Church of Rome*:

O crux ave spes unica,
Hoc passionis tempore,
Auge pijs justitiam,
Reisq; dona veniam.

(f) *Concilium Tridentinum Sessione, 25.*

A Learned Papist, (g) *Raphael de la Torres* saith plainly, *It is lawfull to pray to images, so the inward devotion be directed to God*: But if the Iews in their Idolatrous worship acknoweledged the image to be but a representation of God, and a Book, *Jer.* 10.8. They did no wrong who said *Ier. 2. ver. 27. to a stock, Thou art my father, and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth:* For condition maketh all, if they speak by a figure; for the Papists when they speak to the Crosse, and call the *Crosse their only hope*, the Crosse is not better born nor a stock, it is but timber or dumbe wood: Now how doth not the dumbe wood to which Prayers are made, as if Christ himself were present, partake of Prayers and Gods honour, in an inferior and relative way? For the wood standeth before him who prayeth to it, as God by representation, and as an actuall Vicegerent, and tree-deputy of God and Christ; it is no lesse worshipfull by mouth-worship, by praying to it, as to the passive object of Adoration, as capable of knee-worship by bowing down to it; and a distinction may save idolatry in the one, as well as in the other: And our *Formalists* bowing Religiously to bread, do not Adore bread, (as our half Papists say) and so may they pray to bread, and not Adore bread, for they are as well masters of Grammar, to impose significations at their will upon words, as they be Lords of gestures and Ceremonies, to cause kneeling expresse Veneration to the images, and to elements, and not Divine Adoration.

(g) *Raphael de la Torres in 22. q. 95 art 2. disp. 6. dub. 5. Eusebius, lib. 3. De præparat. Evang.* teacheth us, that *Rudiores tantum ad ligna & lapides respiciunt, sapientes autem (Gentiles) voluerunt Deum & dei virtutes sensibus nostris per imagines nobis familiariter deferri.* They made Images books of God. *Athanasius* in orat. contr. idolat. *Dicunt Philosophi statuas quidem non esse deos, sed simulachra deorum, ideo haberi ut dijs sub istis imaginibus respondeant.*

Here

(h) *Suarez*, in 3. Tho. q. 25. art. 3. disp. 54. Sect. 4. * *O crux ave.*

Here two great Ie*suites*, *Suarez and Vasquez help the matter for* (h) *Suarez saith, There be some acts of Worship as faith and prayer, which precisely respect a reasonable and intelligent person, therefore this prayer* (*Haile* * *crosse*) *it is a figurative speech, and a Metonymie*, continens pro re contenta; *and the speech is directed to him who was crucified, and therefore a prayer* (*saith this* Idolater) *is considered* ut petitio, vel ut honor quidam, *either as a petition, and so it is not directed but to God, but as prayer is an honour expressed in such words and signes, the image also is thought to be honoured by praying to it*, as the samplar to wit Christ, is honoured; soft words. *Answ.* 1. If praying and beleeving doe properly respect a reasonable creature, so doth positive honouring which is esteemed, by the law of nature, *præmium virtutis*, a reward of vertue; now vertue morall to be a foundation of honour, is as vainly given to a tree, or a stocke, as faith and prayer, but to speak to any in prayer, and make our requests known to them may be thought proper onely to a reasonable person, who onely can understand our prayer, and in reason answer our necessities, which a stock cannot doe: but secondly, I answer a stock is by Analogie, and as it is God representatively, as capable of reason to answer, and helpe us, and pitty us, in respect it can notably well represent the Majestie of God, who can answer, helpe, and pitty, as our Idolaters teach, as it is capable of knee-worship, and that honour which is given to God, though in an higher degree; for the formall reason why Images and elements are capable of knee-glory, due to him who sweareth *that all knees shall bow to him*, is, because they represent God, and not because of themselves they have any divinity or Godhead in them. Now the same formall reason holdeth here, for the crosse, stone, tree, or elements that are prayed unto in that religious *state*, as they are the object of praying, doe represent God, therefore they are also capable of faith and prayer, glory, as of knee-worship, or knee-glory. 2. Faith, hope, and charity (as (*i*) *Suarez* saith) in so farre as they are given to God, for giving of honour to him as to the *supream Lord*, they put on the nature of adoration, and *in that same place he defineth adoration to be the exhibition of honour due to any in the acknowlegement* of *excellency and submission* and service due to him: Now *Suarez* reprooveth *Durandus* and *Pic. Mirandula*, because they denied that the Image was adored, but would onely have honour given to God,

We may pray to Images and the elements in the Supper, as well as we may kneel to them.

(i) *Suarez* de tripli. virt. & supr. dis. 51. Sect. 1. pag. 757.

God, at the naked presence of the Image, as a memorable signe, but it is certaine, as to trust in God, and to pray to him is incommunicable to the creature, *so to adore any in acknowledgement of supreame excellencie* is incommunicable to the creature, therefore either the image is adored with the same *knee-worship* that is given to God, and that improperly and by a figure, as *Durandus* and *Mirandula* taught contrary to the mind of *Suarez*, and idolatrous *Iesuites* and *Formalists*, or else prayers may be made to wood and stone, as to God, and that properly and without a figure; as knee-worship is tendered to wood and stone by *Iesuits* doctrine, properly and without a figure. 3. Papists deny that sacrifices may be offered to Images, yet they burne incense to images; but *that is not*, saith (*k*) a Franciscan *Antonius Capellus, a sacrifice, for it is tendred to men, to dead carions, and to things that are blessed, and requireth neither Altar, nor Priest*: It is true, they say so, but burning incense to the brazen Serpent is condemned as Idolatry, and Altar and Priest is not of the essence of a sacrifice; but however as sacrificing is a recognition that we hold all we have of God, and therefore we sacrifice creatures to him, so any adoring of stocks is an acknowledgement that these stocks or stones are by way of representation, that God of whom we hold all the creatures: and doe not Papists for the honour of God, make oblations to Ministers, and burn incense to Saints? and why may not prayers be offered to them also? 4. It is a wild distinction where he saith that *prayers as honour may be tendered to Images, but not prayers as petitions*, whereas the very act of calling *upon God in the day of trouble*, Psal. 50. 15. is an honouring and glorifying *God*, and praying to *God* is due to *God*, as he is to be beleeved in, and to be preached amongst men, *Rom.* 10. 14. 15. And so is he worthy to be glorified as the subject of preaching; then it is a vaine thing to difference betwixt petitioning to *God*, and honouring *God*, because in that I petition *God*, in my necessities, I submit to him as to *God*, who can answer and heare prayers: If therefore the Image and the wood be capable of the honour of praying, it is also capable of the honour of petitioning, so as we may as properly petition and supplicate the stocke, as give to it the glory of prayers. 5. If *Formalists* say in the third person, (*the body Sacramentall of the Lord save thee*,) they may upon the same ground say, (*O thou Sacramentall body of the Lord save me*) for this is

(k) *Antonius Capellus, adversus primatum Regis, Angliæ contrav. 2. Cap. 30.*

is a prayer to God, (O that God would save his people,) no lesse then this, (O God save thy people,) the variation of persons in the Grammar, maketh not the one to be a prayer, and not the other. *Vasquez* (l) saith, *There is not alike reason, why praises, prayers, and Sacrifices should be tendred to Idols, & knee-worship & Adoration, because from the affection of Adoring the samplar, there is derived an externall note of submission to the image, which by a common name is called the honour, Worship and Adoration tendred to the image in a bodily manner, and being done before the image, tendeth to the honouring of the samplar; but the outward action of Praising, Praying, Sacrificing, is commonly called Praising, Praying, Sacrificing, in relation to the Samplar, to wit, God, and no way in relation to the image, or to things without life; neither are they by accident referred to the images, only they be tendred to God before images,* Coram illis. But I Answer, This is but to beg the Question, for we deny, that from Adoring the image, *there resulteth any Adoring of God,* but a great dishonouring of his Name. 2. *Durandus, Mirandula, Hulcot,* deny that Adoring of God, *Coram imaginibus tanquam signis memorativis, before the images as memorials of God,* should be an Adoring of the images: And *Suarez* saith, *If images be only remembrances and memorials in the act of Adoration, this taketh much honour from the images, and is,* saith (m) he, *An Adoring of the Samplar, but not an Adoring of the image*: Though (n) *Vasquez,* expounding *Gregories* minde, (which superstitious man calleth them, (o) *good books*) contradict *Suarez* in this, yea, and himself also; for he saith, *The enemies of images* (he meaneth the Reformed Churches) *who use them only for memorials and books,* (it is a lye that we use them as books,) *will not bow their knee to them, for then* (saith he) *they should Adore them; and therefore* (saith *Vasquez,*) *if Christ be not in very deed, in his presence in the Sacrament present, the knee-worship is tendred to bread and wine, which is* (saith he) *Idolatry*; therefore either our Formalists are Transubstantiators, or Idolaters, or both;

(l) *Vasquez* to. 1 part. 3. q 25. art. 23. disp. 109. cap. 4.

(m) *Suarez* tom. 1. in 3. q. 25. art. 3. disp. 54. Sect. 5. *Si tantum coram imaginibus Adoratur deus, hoc multum derogat imaginum veneration, nam ex eo non tantum sequitur imagines* [*clementa Sacramentalia*] *minus coli, quam exemplaria, sed etiam sequitur illas non coli omnino,---sed exemplaria tantum.* (n) *Vasquez*, tom. 1. part. 3, q. 25. disp. 108. cap. 14. *Nam iconomachi qui ad solam recordationem imagi nibus utuntur, ante illas genua non flectunt nec se prostemunt; sic enim ipsas notâ exteriore adorarent, sed erecti absque ullo corporis gestu, qui reverentiam indicet, coram imagine exemplaris recordantur, & ipsum spiritu solum adorant.*

[o] *Gregorius Mag.* l. 7. Epist. 53. if these be his Epistles.

by

by this learned Iesuites judgement, and why by this same reason may we not say against (p) *Vasquez*, that the bodily offerings of prayers, prayses, and sacrifices to God, before the Image as the Image, is an honouring of the Image by prayer, they say to the tree of the Crosse.

Auge piis justitiam, reisq; dona veniam.

Increase righteousnesse in us, and give *remission of sinnes, O tree crosse to guilty sinners.* Names at *Rome* goe as men will, but the honour it selfe is put upon the dumbe wood, which is due to Christ. O it is but a figure (say they) yea but (say we) prayers and praises in a bodily manner, and vocally are tendred to the wood, yet if the wife commit adultery with her husbands brother, because he representeth her husband, I thinke the matter should be washen with Inke, and badly excused to say, O the loving wife for strong love to her husband committeth figurative adultery, and that bodily harlotry is referred to the brother of her husband by accident, and to her husband kindly, and *per se*, for himselfe. The same way, if Formalists bow their knee to bread, that *such a holy mystery be not prophaned.* We know they cannot understand civill or countrey non-prophanation, that they intend; for kneeling and evill maners at the Lords table doe well consist together. Now religious non-prophanation by knee-worship, is adoring of these mysterious elements. *Ergo* they make prayers and sing praises, and offer sacrifices to the bread, Let them see to this and answer to it if they can. The sixt evasion of wit, I find in (q) *Johannes de Lugo*, who saith, 1. *That the image and samplar making one and the same object, by aggregation, the inward affection besides externall knee-worship is given to both, but to the Image relatively, and for God or the samplar, and not for proper divine excellencie in it, and therefore the Counsels* (saith he) *call it not adoration* in spiritu, *but it is tendered to God absolutely*

(p) *Vasquez ibid.* Hee who adoreth a saint (saith *Ioan. de lugo de myster. incarnat disp. 36. sect. 3. n. 29.*) for friendship and grace which hee hath *argutivè*, by consequence hee worshipeth *God* of whom the man hath grace, yet it is not needfull that he formally adore God, and *in recto* in so doing for he may honour the saint and not formally honour God, for the saint

and God are two divers objects. *Answ.* This proveth our point, that when I adore an Image, intending to adore God, some soule-adoration adhereth to the Image, and that is a taste of Gods proper glory given to a stocke, or a stone. (q) *Ioan. de lugo. de myst. incar. disp. 36. sect. 3. n. 25, 26, 27. & seq. Respectus imaginis est quasi materialis & inanimatus, quia sic aperimus caput imagini, ut per illam actionem nihil velimus imagini dicere aut significare, sed soli exemplari, ad quod dirigitur ille actus prout significativus & prout civilis communicatio; & ideo respectu illius solum videtur esse actio animata. De Lugo ibid. Hoc enim esset stultum mendacium, quia absolutè loquendo meliores sumus nos quam Imago sancti Petri.* And conforme to this the seventh pretended and bastard Councell calleth them halfe holy, and halfe true, halfe false worshipers of God; *Antonius Capellus* citeth it, *Adversus. prim. regis Angliæ, c. 30.* Who will have Images to stand onely for memorialls, but not to be worshipped.

solutely. 2. *We give adoration of internall submission to God, or the samplar as the debt of potestative justice, but We doe not so Worship the Image, We have no civill or politick communication With the Image, because it is not a reasonable creature, and therefore the Worship of the Image is as it were a materiall and livelesse action; When We uncover our head to the Image, by that action We would say or signifie nothing to the Image, but to the samplar, or to God onely.* 3. *The inward submission that We tender to the Image, is not that We submit to it, as to a thing more excellent then We, for that were a fooliſh lye;* yet (saith he) (that the man might fulfill the cup of the iniquity of his Fathers) *We kisse not the Image* in recto *directly tendring honour to it, but to God and the samplar before it.* 1. *Because then* I *should adore my owne breast When I knocke upon it adoring the Eucharist.* 2. *Because so I bow to the Wall before me.* 3. *If I have no honourable opinion of the Image, I doe not adore it at all.* 4. *By kneeling to the* Image, I *have a Will of submitting externally my affection to the* Image, I *yeeld to it, as a thing above me, giving to it the higher place.* 4. *The act of adoration is simply terminated upon the* Image, *as a thing contra distinguished from the samplar, though it be adored With the same action With which the samplar is adored.* Thus the Iesuite.

Concil. seventh art. 1. p. 458. Qui vero dicunt sufficere usum imaginum ad memoriam solum, non vero ad salutationem eas habentes illud quidem recipientes, hoc vero rejicientes, semiprobi quadantenus, & falso veri [ut ita dicam] deprehenduntur.

Answ. But here all men may see many contradictions, and that he casteth downe all that formerly he hath said, 1. Images even as they represent God are dead things, and lesse then a redeemed Saint, *Ergo*, I can give them no submission of externall honour. 2. I signifie and say nothing of honour to the Image, even as it respecteth *God*, and representeth him, because the dignity of representing *God* doth not elevate it to be a reasonable creature, therefore I cannot honour it, and it were a *fooliſh lye* to say that the Image as representing *God*, were a reasonable creature. 3. As it representeth *God*, it cannot heare payers, nor deliver in trouble, as the *Holy One of Israel* can doe; *Ergo* by the Holy Ghosts argument, I cannot bow to a lye, *Esa.* 44. 17. and 46. 9. *Hab.* 2. 19, 20. it made not the heaven and the earth, but by a figure, because it representeth the maker of heaven and earth, wherefore it should have but figurative honour at the best, and that is no reall honour, *Jer.* 10. 8, 11, 12, 4. There is no debt of justice due to the dumb wood, or element, honour of externall submission is a debt of potestative justice due to a superiour, the Images and Elements are not my superiour.

1. They

1. They be meanes, I the end. 2. They bee void of life and reason which I have. 3. They are not redeemed, sanctified, and to be glorified as I am. *Ioan. de Lugo* answereth, *As I may love* Peter *for the goodnesse that is not in* Peter, *but in another, as I may love and desire good to* Peter, *for the goodnesse that is in his father, and not in himself, and so pay the debt of affection to him for another, so I may honour an Image for the debt of honour that I owe to the samplar represented by the Image, therefore it is not required to the essence of adoration, that we acknowledge debt due to every thing adored for another; it is sufficient a debt be acknowledged, either to the Image, or the samplar.* Answ. The debt of love and the debt of honour are not alike. I owe honour to superiours onely as superiours, I owe love to superiours, equals, inferiours. If I truly adore an Image, I truly acknowledge excellency in the Image, I truly yeeld to it, a worthier place then I deserve to have my selfe, (saith (*r*) *de Lugo*) *Ergo*, by the fifth Commandement according to the debt of justice, I owe feare, honour, and reverence to it, else I adore it by a figure, which the Iesuite doth deny.

I am not afraid that they say, *Damascen*, (*s*) a superstitious Monke alloweth Images to be adored. So doeth (*t*) that pretended seventh Synod, or (*u*) the second Nicene Synod, and (*x*) *Stephanus* and *Adrianus*, as we may read in *Iuo*. (*y*) *Nicephorus* speaketh many fables for Images, he sheweth us that *Luke* the Evangelist should have painted the Images of Christ and the Virgin *Mary*. (*z*) And that (*a*) holy *Silvester* had the Images of *Peter* and *Paul*, and shewed them to the Emperour *Constantine*, and (*b*) *Canisius* a fabulous man saith, there appeared to *Silvester* at the dedication feast of Saint *Salvators* church the picture of *Christ* in the Wall, but the originall of Images seemeth to be the vanity of man, saith (*c*) the Wiseman. 2. The keeping of the dead in memory, saith (*d*) *Cyprian, ad defunctorum vultus per imaginem detinendos expressa sunt simulachra, inde posteris facta sunt sacra quæ primitus assumpta fuerunt solatia, in aliis codicibus ad solatia.* 3. The blinde heathen wanting the light of Scripture, began to worship Images. (*e*) *Eusebius* saith it began first ἐθνικὴ συνηθεία, from the Heathenish custome it came that *Peter* and *Pauls* Images were first made. Men did it saith (*f*) *Augustine, ut Paganorum concilient benevolentiam*, to conciliate the favour of Pagans, it may bee seene out of *Gregorius*

(r) *De Lugo ibid.* 39.
imagini vere cedo exterius, dando illi meliorē & superiorem locum honorifice eam tractando.
(s) *Orat.* 3. *de imagin.*
(t) 7. *Synod act.* 4.
(w) *Nicene Synod* 2.
(x) *Iuo* 4. *part. sui decret. c.* 38.
(y) *Nicephorus hist. lib.* 2. *c.* 17.
(z) *Nicephorus hist. li.* 2. *c.* 43: *lib.* 6. *c.* 16.
(a) *Lib.* 7. *c.* 33.
(b) *Canisius lib.* 5. *De Beata virgine, c.* 22. Divers Fables touching Images.
(c) *Sap.* 14.
(d) *De idolo vanit.*
(e) *Euseb. lib.* 7. *c.* 8.
(f) *August. contra Adamant c.* 13.

(g) *Gregor. mag. Epist. ad Serenum Massilien-sem lib. 7. Ep. 109.*

(g) *Magnus*, saith (h) *Voetius*, that the worshiping of *Images crept in but the sixt age.* In the first three hundred yeeres, *Images were not admitted* (saith our Country-man (i) *Patrick Sympson*) *into the place of Worship, in the fourth, fifth and sixt Centurie, they were admitted into Temples, but for the most part without opinion of adoration.* In the second *Nicene Councell*, an obscure age, (saith (k) *Petrus Molinæus*) when *the Scriptures were taken away, it is ordained that Images should be adored, but not the Images of the Father.* Quoniamquis sit non novimus, deiq; natura spectanda proponi non potest ac pingi. *But onely the Image of the Son.* This Councell was *Anno* 787. as saith [l] *Bellarmine.* But this wicked Fathers argument proves also that the Image of God the Father may be painted, while they prove worshipping of Images, because the Psalmist saith, *The Lord arose as a mighty man after Wine.* But [m] *Genebrard* saith this Councell of *Nice*, was controuled by a Councell in the *West*. [n] *Barronius* mentioneth two Epistles written by *Gregorious* 2. a defender of Images, wherein he saith, the Sonne may be painted, not the Father. This Councell was approved by *Constantine*, *Ireneus*, and a Greeke copie of the Synod sent to [o] *Adrian the Pope.* But 1. this wicked Synod did not maintaine adoration of Images, such as *Suarez*, *Bellarmine*, *Vasquez*, *Perierius*, &c. now hold, but onely veneration. 2. Images were placed in the Churches, saith [p] *Paul. Diaconus*, *multis contra dicentibus*, many speaking against it. And [q] *Bergomens.* saith, *the Emperour Constantine himselfe not long after did abrogate the Acts of this Synod*, and [r] *the Synod of Franckford* condemned this Synod. See [s] *Aventinus*; (t) *Hincmarus* saith it is true they of *Franckford* allowed Images to be in Churches, but not to be adored. (w) *Vrspergensis* saith that this synod did write a book against the second Councell of *Nice*, called otherwise the seventh generall Councell. A booke came out in *France*, and after in *Germany* under the name of *Charles the Great*, condemning by strong reasons the adoration of Images, and answereth all the arguments of the Nicene Fathers on the contrary; *Tannerus* the *Iesuite* saith this was a forged Booke. But against sa-

[h] *Voetius in desper. caus. papat. lib. 3. c. 6. sect. 2.*

[i] *Sympson 6. Century of the worshipping of Images, p. 38.*

[k] *Pet. Molinæus Buckler of Faith of Images, Sect. 118. pag. 308.*

[l] *Bellarm de script. in Chron.*

[m] *Genebrard chron. an. 794. p. 308.*

(n) *Barronius An. 726.*

Observe that *Æneas Sylvius epist. 301.* saith, *ante Nicenam Synodum unusquisq; sibi vivebat, quemadmodum sibi visum est, & parvus respectus ad Romanam ecclesiam habebatur*, a Metropolitan Bishop, a step to the Popedome, was first created here in *Romes Carthage, Constantinople, Antiochia.* [o] *Pontific.* [p] *Paulus diaconus lib. 13.* [q] *Bergomensis lib. 10.* [r] Synod *Franckford.* [s] *Aventinus lib. 4.* [t] *Hincmarus cap. 20. contra Iauduxensem.* [w] *Vrspergens. in Histor.*

mous

mous and learned Authors saying the contrary, and so [x] *Hincmarius* and [y] *Ectius* make mention of this book, and Pope *Adrianus* (as [z] *Hospinianus* doth well observe) doth approve of this Synod of *Francford* by his Letters written to the Emperour of *Constantinople*, and the Patriarch *Tharasius*.

The first five hundred years (saith [a] *Calvin*) images were not worshipped. *Cajus Caligula* a proud Tyrant, commanded the Iews to set up his image in the Temple: the Iews answered they should rather die then pollute the Temple of God with images, as saith [b] *Iosephus* and [c] *Eusebius*, and this fell out while the Apostles lived.

Ann. 108. *Plinius* 2. writeth to *Trajanus* under the third Persecution, *That Christians were men of good conversation, and detested vices, worshipped Christ, and would not worship Images* (d), as that Letter beareth: and (e) *Eusebius*, reporteth *Adrian* had a purpose, (as saith (f) *Bucolc.*) to build a Church for the honour of Christ void of Images. See (g) *Symson* that ancient Writer: (h) *Justine Martyr* in this Age; *Omnes imagines ad cultum propositas simpliciter damnant Christiani.* (i) *Tertullian*, a most ancient writer, who lived under *Severus* in time of the fifth Persecution, as (k) the *Magdeburgenses* testifie; saith, *Nos adoramus oculis ad cælum sublatis, non ad imagines seu picturas*, and, *indignum ut imago Dei vivi imagini idoli, & mortui: fiat similis*, (saith (l) he also) and not only thinketh it unlawfull to represent God by an Image, but also saith, that Craftsmen, who professe themselves Christians, ought not to make Images of God. An ancient Writer (m) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Non est nobis imago sensibilis de materiâ sensibili, nisi quæ precipitur intelligentiâ. Deus enim qui solus est verè Deus, intelligentiâ precipitur, non sensu*: *We have no sensible Image of sensible matter, because God is taken up by the understanding, not by the sense*: and (n) *Nihil in rebus genitis potest referre Dei imaginem.* This ancient Writer flourished, saith (o) Catolog. *Testium veritat.* Anno 150. or as (p) *Hospinian* saith Ann. 200. and (q) *Ireneus*, the disciple

[x] *Hincmarin. Archiepiscopus Remorum* c. 10. cont. *Hincmarin. Iandunensem Episcop.*

(y) *Eccius in Euchirid.*

(z) *Hospin.* de orig. imag. p. 197.

[a] *Calvin.* justit. lib. 1. cap. 11. Sect. 13.

[b] *Iosephus* antiq. lib. 18. cap. 11.

[c] *Euseb.* histor. lib. 2. cap. 6.

[d] *Epist. Plinii. 2 ad Imperat Trajan.*

[e] *Eusch.* Histor. lib. 3. cap. 33.

[f] *Bucolc.* in *Alexand. severo.*

[g] *Symson* 1. Century cap. 1.

[h] *Justin. Martyr.* in Dialog. cum. Trypho. & apolog. 2. [i] *Tertullian.* apo. cap. 30. [k] *Magdeburgens.* cent. 3. cap. 10. (l) *Apol.* 1. 9. 11. [m] *Clemens Alexand.* in Paræneticо. [n] in s. Stromat. [o] Catolog. *testium veritat.* lib. 2. pag. 87. (p) *Hospinian. de origine imag.* cap. 10. pag. 155. (q) *Irenæus*, l. 1. cap. 24.

ciple of *Polycarpus*, an hearer of *John* the Apostle maketh it the Heresie of the *Gnosticks*, that they held that Pilate made the Image of Iesus: *Et quod imagines haberent Christi, Apostolorum atque Philosophorum, easque coronarent, ac colendas proponerent.* (a) *Cyprian* saith, *Idols, or Images, be not only against the Law of God, but against the nature of man*; (b) *Origen* said, *The Images of Christians are Christians indeed, with Gods Image*: and, *Nos vero ideo non honoramus simulachra, quia quantũ possumus, caveamus, ne incidamus in eam crudelitatem, ut et iis tribuamus divinitatis aliquid.* (c) Grave *Athanasius* saith, ἡ τῶν εἰδώλων ἔυρεσις ὐκ ἀπ' ἀγαθῆ, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κακῆ γέγονε, τὸ ὃ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχον κακὴν, ἐν ὀδενὶ ποτὲ καλὸν κριθείη, ὅλον ὂν φαῦλον· *The invention of Images is from an evil fountain, and not from good, and whatsoever hath a bad beginning, cannot be deemed in any thing good, being altogether bad:* The Papist *Harding* bringeth in a counterfeit Dialogue of *Athanasius*, betwixt Christ and his Church; and Christ comforting his Church, because she was persecuted for worshipping Christs Image; but when and where this persecution was, none knoweth, for many times hath the Church been persecuted for not worshipping Images; but see the answer of the learned (d) *Jewell* thereunto; (e) *Epiphanius*, who lived, *Anno* 370. proveth against the *Collyridians*, That *Mary* nor no creature should be adored. *Unde est simulachrificum hoc studium et diabolicus conatus? pretextu enim justitiæ semper subiens hominum, mentem drabolus, mortalem naturam in hominum oculis deificans, Statuas humanas, imagines pre se ferentes per artum, veritatem expressit, et mortui quidem sunt qui adorantur*: Item, *Revera sanctum erat corpus Mariæ, non tamen Deus, honorata, non in adorationem data. Mary was not God, and therefore is not to be adored*: He professeth that he did rive a vail, that had painted in it the Image of Christ, or of some man, *Cum ego videssem in Ecclesia Christi, contra authoritatem scripturarum, hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud, &c.*

Lactantius Formianus, Images are to represent these who are absent, God is every where present, it is vanity therefore to forme an image of God. Also (h) *There is no Religion, where there is an image*: Also

(a) *Cyprian* cont. demetrianum. 1.
[b] *Origen.* cont. cel. sum. l. 8.
[c] *Athanas.* adverss. gentes.
[d] *Jewell* against *Harding* 14. art. of adorat. pag. 505, 507.
[e] *Epiphanius* lib. 3. cont. *Collyridianos.*
[f] Idem ibid.
(g) *Lactantius*, institut. l. 2. cap. 2. *Etenim hominis imago necessaria tum videtur, cum procul abest, supervacua futura cum presto est, dei autem cujus spiritus ac numen ubique diffusum, abesse nunquam potest, semper utique imago supervacua est.*

The Arguments of the ancients against Images. [h] *Lactantius* lib. 2. cap. 19.

your

(i) *your gods be either in Heaven, or not; if they be not in Heaven, Why do ye Worship them? If they be in Heaven, Why do ye not lift your eyes to Heaven While you adore them? Why do you convert your eyes toward Walls, stocks and stones, rather then toward that place where you imagine your gods to be?*

(k) His Arguments against Images be these: (l) 1. *They forget reason, When they fear the Work of their own hands:* 2. (m) *God is not absent, but present every where:* 3. (n) *The image is a dead thing void of sense, God is the eternall and everliving God:* 4. (o) *Nothing mortall should be Worshipped.* 5. (p) *What vanity to hope for protection from these things, which cannot defend themselves?* 6. (q) *The image is lesse and viler then the Worshipper:* 7. (r) *Man according to Gods image, is the image of God.* 8. (s) *God needeth nothing, neither torches because he made the light, nor images.* This man lived, *Anno* 300. Before which time the Church of Christ being persecuted, they had no Churches, nor Images to be ornaments in their Churches, as saith (t) *Ambrosius*, and also (u) *Chrysostom*, who was displeased with the fooleries in Temples in his time, and saith, *They were not like the Temples of the Apostolick Churches*: and (x) *Tertullian*, and (y) *Eusebius* saith, They had then, *Simplices domos, Simple houses, void of paintries and pictures*: And the want of Temples was objected against Christian Religion, as (z) *Origen* cleareth in the time of *Constantine*, the son of *Chlorus*, as saith, (a) *Sozomen*, and (b) *Eusebius*, Temples were builded, but as (c) *Joan. Quintinus* expounded *Tertullian*, *Without the ornaments of images*, and (d) *Tertullian* himself maketh building of Altars, and portracts, *Idolatricos cultus, Idolatrous Worship*. In the fourty years space, betwixt the reign of *Valerian*, and the 19. year of *Diocletian*, there were Oratories and Temples builded, but neither painted Pictures, nor Images in them, as saith [e] *Eusebius*: Yea, of thirty Bishops of *Rome*, even from *Peter* and *Paul* to *Sylvester*, and *Constantine* the Emperour; to wit, three hundred years, there were none, who were not persecuted to blood, or to death, or some other way. It is a vain thing to say, they had breathing time to build

[i] Ib. *Cur ad pariates & signa, & lapides potissimum quam illo spectatis, ubi eos esse creditis.*
ib. instit. div. l. 2. c. 1.
(k) instit. l. 2. c. 2.
(l) Ibid.
[m] *Instit.* l. 2. c. 3.
[n] *Instit.* l. 2. c. 4.
[o] *Instit.* l. 2. c. 18.
[p] *Ibid.*
(q) *Instit.* l. 6. c. 11.
(r) *Ambros. officior* l. 2. cap. 21.
(s) *Chrys.* l. 2. et ist. 246.
(x) *Tertullian apol et cont. valent.*
(y) *Eusebii* hist. ec. l. 9. c. 10.
(z) *Origen* cont. clef. l. 9. c. 4.
(a) *Sozomen* l. 1. c. 8.
(b) *Eusb. in vita constan.* l. 2.
(c) *Joan. Armitants in explanatio can 5. concilii gangren*
[d] *Tertull.* lib. de Idol. *Plutarch in vitæ Numæ non dum ingenia Grecorum atque Tuscorum fingendis simulachris urbem inundaverunt, ita Tertullian, Apol. c. 25.*
(f) *Euseb.* Hist. eccles. l. 8. c. 1.

Temples

Temples, and erect Altars, and golden Images of Christ, and the *Virgin Mary*, and the Saints. It is true, in the two hundreth year after Christ, under *Alexander Severus*, *Gordianus*, *Philippus*, *Gallienus*; Churches were builded, as [f] *Nicephorus* saith, but again under *Diocleſian* they were demoliſhed to the ground, but obſerve well there were no Images of Christ broken, which that Tyrant in deſpite of Christ, would not have omitted; ſee [g] *Euſebius*, they were builded again under great *Conſtantine*, ſo [h] *Sozomen*, [i] *Otho Phriſingenſis* [k] and *Nicephorus*. The dream of *Platina*, for the building of a Church, by the donation of *Conſtantine*, with twelve portions of earth, equall to the number of the twelve Apoſtles, and of another Church, with the title of the holy Croſſe at *Ieruſalem*, which *Helena* found in that place, and *Conſtantine* placed in this Church at *Rome*, is refuted by [l] *Hoſpinian*: yet is there no word of any Images in theſe Churches.

[f] *Nicephorus* l. 7. c. 2.
(g) *Euſeb.* l. 8. c. 2.
[h] *Sozomen* tripart. hiſtor. l. 1. c. 9.
(i) *Otto Phriſingenſis* l. 4. c. 3.
(k) *Nicephorus* l. 8. c. 27.
[l] *Hoſpinian de Orig. Templo* cap. 6. pag. 34.

[m] *Arnobius* An. 330. maintaineth againſt the heathen, that the *Chriſtians* ought to have no Images: 1. *Becauſe the device of images is a novelty, and was not before two thouſand years, but God and Religion are no new things.* 2. [n] *Becauſe either the Gods dwelleth in their images, againſt their will, or of their own accord; if the former be ſaid, they are compelled, which is abſurd. If the latter, then they do either bide alwayes in their images, and ſo are miſerable, or they go out of the images when they pleaſe, and then the images are empty things.*

[m] *Arnob.* cont. gent. lib. 2.
[n] Ib. lib. 6. & lib. 7.

[a] *Euſebius Cæſarienſis* who lived, *An.* 300. when *Conſtantia Auguſta* wrote to him for the Image of Christ, anſwered. That could not be: 1. *Becauſe his manhood was joyned with his Godhead, and could not be ſeparated therefrom.* 2. *Becauſe his Godhead cannot be repreſented, Mortuis, & inanimatis coloribus, with dead and liveleſſe colours.* [b] *Hieronimus*, who lived, *An.* 331. under *Conſtantine*, denyeth that any Creature, Angel, or Virgin *Mary* ſhould be worſhipped. [c] *Ruffinus* ſaith, Helena *the mother of* Conſtantine *adored crucified Chriſt, but antiquity ſaith not, that ſhe adored the nails that fixed him to the Croſſe, becauſe they were but creatures.*

(a) *Euſeb. Cæſarienſ. Epiſt. ad Conſtantiam Auguſtam.*
(b) *Hyeron.* cont. *Vigilantium, ad Riparum Presbiter.*
[c] *Ruffinus* hiſt. eccl. l. 1. c. 8.

[d] *Ambroſius*, who lived, *Anno* 370. condemneth Images: 1. *Becauſe they change the images of the dead, in the glory of God, who worſhippeth images:* 2. *The living ſerve the dead.* 3. *They take from*

[d] *Ambro.* in cap. 1. epiſt. ad Rom.

ſtock

stocks and stones What they are, and give to them, What they are not. 4. [e] *Idols are unclean.* 5. *It is undecent* [f], *to Worship What men maketh With their hands.* 6. *Because* [g] *images are but shadows.*

[h] *Augustine* condemneth Images. 1. *Because they infect the vveak mindes of rude people, to Worship them.* 2. *They have eyes and see not.* 3. *The creatures are images of God, not stocks.* 4. *Idols* [i] *are huskes and empty.* 5. *These* (k) *Who brought in Images, tooke away the feare of God, and increased error.* 6. *Martyrs* (l) *are not gods.* 7. *Confounded* (m) *be they Who Worship stones, our living stone Christ is in heaven.*

8. (a) Though *Worshippers of* Images *say, they Worship God in Images, yet they Worship devills; for good men, as* Paul *and* Barnabas, Angels, *and* Cornelius *forbade men to Worship them.* 9. *It is a shame to adore a beast endowed With sense and life, farre more to adore a dumbe and liveless creature,* August, *ps.* 113. (b) *Chrysostome* is against Images. 1. *Because the Law of God forbiddeth them.* 2. (c) *God must be honoured, as he Willeth himselfe.* 3. *It is* (d) *a depressing of soules to Worship Images.* (e) *It commeth from Satan to take Gods glory from him,* (f) *it is mockerie that man should be the creator of God, the Creator of all things.*

(g) *Cyrillus Alexandrin.* who lived *An.* 415. *saith, We neither beleeve the martyrs to be gods, nor doe We adore them.*

(h) *Damascen* a superstitious man much for Images acknowledgeth two things. 1. That Images are but ἄγραφος παράδοσις *unWritten traditions.* 2. He ackowledgeth that the *brazen Serpent, the Cherubims Were made for signification, not for imitation or adoration.*

(i) *Gregorius Magnus*, though he be alledged by Papists for adoration of Images. Yet in his Epistle to *Serenus* Bishop of *Massilia, An.* 600. he forbiddeth the adoration of Images, and alloweth onely the Historicall use of them, as is observed by (k) *Fran. White,* (l) by *Hospinian* and (m) *Catol. testum veritatis*, and (n) this man being the first who brought Images into the Church hath this Caveat, *atque indica* (saith he to *Sirenus*) *quod non tibi, ipsa visio historiæ quæ, pictura teste, pandebatur, displicuerit: sed illa adoratio quæ pictu-*

(e) *Ambros. offices l.* 1. *c.* 26.
(f) Ibid.
(g) Ibid.
(h) *Aug. Epist.* 49.
i *Aug. de doct. Christi. lib.* 3. *c.* 7.
k *De Civit. dei l.* 4. *c.* 9.
l *De civit. dei lib.* 22. *c.* 10.
m *August. in Ps.* 96.
a *August. in Psal.* 96.
b *Chrysost. hom.* 49. *in Math.*
c *Idem homil.* 51. *in Math.*
d *Idem hom.* 33. *in Mat.*
e *Hom.* 1. *ad pop. an.*
f *In* 3. *c. Is.*
g *Damascen de Imagin. orat.* 2.
h *Gregor. lin.* 9. *ep.* 9. *Perlatum est ad nos, quod inconsidera-to zelo succensus sanctorum imagines sub hac, quasi excusatione, ne adorari debuissent, confregeris, & quidem, quia eas adorari, vetuisses omnino laudamus, fregisse vero reprehendimus.* k *Fran. Whites* way to the Church, *ch.* 9. *sect.* 2. *p.* 114. l *Hospinian de Origen Imag. p.* 174. m *Catol. test. veritat l.* 6. *p.* 562. n *Greg. mag. lib.* 9. *ep.* 9.

ris fuerit in competenter exhibita, & si quis imagines facere voluerit, minimè prohibe, adorare vero imagines omnibus modis divita, sed hoc solicitè admoneas, ut ex visione rei gestæ, ardorem conjunctionis percipiant, & in adoratione solius Trinitatis prosternantur. It is cleare that this man teacheth an adoration of Images, though he make them onely bookes to the rude. This same (*o*) *Gregorius* will have the signe of the crosse adored, because when the Devill came to a Iew sleeping in the night in the Temple of an Idoll, the Iew being afraid, signed himselfe with the Crosse, and the Divell fled; but when doth Iewes come in any Christian Churches, or Idoll-Temples, who abhorre the name of Christ, and so hate both the Crosse and Christ, and what can be proved from a fact of Sathan?

In the eighth age, (*p*) *Beda Imaginum cultus & adoratio*, the worshipping and adoring of Images is unlawfull. 1. Because they have no office in the doctrine of the Gospell. 2. (*q*) *We are forbidden to adore, salute, or worship them.* 3. *The* (*d*) *Church is not taught to seeke the Lord by Images, but by faith and good Workes.* 4. *The* (*s*) *Apostolique Church did not worship God in Images.* 5. *Images* (*t*) *Want*, documento antiquitatis, *antiquity, example, and the Scripture.* 6. *We* (*w*) *frustrate God of worship due to him.* 7. Peter (*u*) Paul, *Angels forbad to worship them, but God only.*

We forbid the Church (*saith the civill Law*) *to be obscured with Images. Have the* Image *of God*, (saith (*x*) *Ephrem*) *in thy heart*, non colorum varietate in ligno, *not in* Images *and colours. Who can make* (saith (*y*) *Damascen*) *a representation of the invisible God.* (*z*) Gretserus *saith, the* Iewes *would not admit of Ensignes and Trophies of the Romans for fear* Images *should be hidden under them.* So said *Josephus* (a) before him. Their own men say with us, (b) *Hulcot* who lived *an.* 1346. saith *Latreia, divine worship belongeth to God onely, the* Image *is not God, neither the Crosse*; (saith Ioan. *Pic. Mirandula*, Concl. 3.) *nor the* Image *of Christ is to be adored* (*adoratione Latreia eo modo quo ponit* Thomas) *with divine worship, the guise of* Thomas Aquinas (*c*) *Peresius Ajala* a Popish Bishop, *for adoration of Images*, saith he, *there is neither Scripture, nor Church tradition, nor consent of Fathers, nor good reason to make it good.* For saith (d) *Gabriel*

o Greg. mag. lib. 3. dialo.

p Beda l. 2. c. 21. ad peragenda nostra salutis mysteria nullum penitus officium habere noscuntur.

q Beda l. 1. c. 9. adorare, salutare, colare, inhibemur pene in cunctis scripturæ locis.

r Idem l. 1. c. 21.

s Idem l. 1. c. 24.

Idem l. 6. c. 21.

t Ibid.

u Lib. 2. cap. 25.

w Cod. l. 8. tit. 12. leg. 20. Theodos. Valentinian.

x Ephrem. secunde.

y Damascen de fid. Orthod. l. 4. c. 17.

z Gretser. lib. 1. de cruc. c. 44.

a Ioseph lib. 18. c. 6.

b Hulcot in lib. sup. lect. 158. Ioan. Pic. Mirandula concluf. 3.

c Peresius Ajala de trad. pag. 3. De Imagineq; scripturam neq; traditionem, ueq; communem sensum sanctorum, neque concilium generalis determinationem, neq; etiam rationem adducunt.

d Gabriel Biel in Can. lec. 49.

Biel

Biel, The image either considered in it self as it is mettall or stone, or as it is a holy signe, is a sensible Creature, to which Latreia, *Divine honour* should not be given: and the Romish (c) Decrees saith, *We commend you that you forbid images of Saints to be Worshipped*: The (d) *Doway* Doctors say, *Idols have eyes and cannot see, &c.* Now if they have Images of God and Christ which can see, and hear, and speak, we exceedingly desire to know: (e) *Alexander Allensis*, [f] *Durandus* say, That *images in themselves, and properly, are not to be Worshipped.*

[g] Geo: Cassander *wisheth, That they had continued* (in majorum suorum sententia) *in the minde of their forefathers, and that the Superstition of people in Worshipping images had been suppressed.* The Councell convened by [h] *Constantius Capronimus* condemneth Worshipping of Images, or placing them in Churches. 1. *Because it is forbidden in the second Commandment.* 2. *The Picturing of Christ is a dividing of the two Natures.* 3. *It is against the Ancients, Epiphanius, Nazianzen, Chrysostome, Athanasius, Amphylocius, Theodorus, Eusebius Pamphili.* The Councell of Nice is builded upon lies. *Adrian* Bishop of *Rome*, writeth to the Councell of Nice, That the Emperour *Constantine* being a Leaper, and labouring to cure his Leprosie by shedding of innocent Babes blood; *Peter* and *Paul* appeared to him by night, in a Vision, and bade him go to be Baptized by *Sylvester*, and that he, to be cured by *Sylvesters* Baptizing, builded a Temple with the Images of *Peter* and *Paul*. This is as true as the Image of Christ spake to *Tho: Aquinas* at *Naples, Bene Scripsisti de me, Thoma,* Why is not all Evangell that *Aquinas* hath written then? For their own *Platina* (a) saith, The story of *Constantines* Leprosie is a fable; and *Socrates* saith, That *Constantine* was sick when he was 65. years, and he maketh no mention of his leprosie; so (b) *Hospinianus* saith, and our own (c) *Simson* saith, That *Sylvester* and *Marcus his successor were both dead before* Constantine *was Baptized:* (d) *Genebradus* a Papist saith,

c *Decret.* 3. dist. 3. c. 27. *Grego.*

d *Doway* men, Annot. 2 *Sam.* 5. 8. The blinde and the lame shall not enter in the Temple.

e *Alexand. Alens.* 3. p. q. 30. art. ult.

f *Durand.* l. 3. dist. 9. q. 2.

g *Cassand. In Consultatione ad ferdinandum & maximilianum art. An.* 1170.

h *Concil. Constantinopolit. An.* 755. of 338. Bishops. Yea, this same second councel of Nice, condemneth

and the seventh Epistle to the Synod, condemneth *Nestorius* of Idolatry, and the *Arians* as Idolaters, who Worshipped Christ whom they believed to be a man onely: And *Athanasius*, contr. *Arian.* Orati. 1. And *Nyssenus* in Laud. Bas. And *Nazianzen*, Orati. 40. say. To Adore a Creature, though in the Name of Christ or God, is Idolatry.

a *Platina in vita Marci. Papæ.* b *Hospin.* de orig. perogimatio. pag. 381. c *Symson*, Treatise of Images, p. 47. d *Genebrad.* in Chron. l. 2. *Anno* 1794.

down right, that the Councell of *Frankford* condemned the second Nicene Councell; *But* (e) *Bellarmine*, (f) *Suarez*, (g) *Sanderus* (h) *Alanus*, *deny that the Doctrine of the second Nicene Councell for Adoring images, is Condemned by the Councell of* Frankford; *they say it is onely expounded, and that the right way of Adoring images is made manifest*: Yea, saith (i) *Nauclerus*, (k) *Sabellicus*, and (l) *Blandus*: *The Councell of Frankford reserveth due honour to images, and saith nothing against the Councell of Nice.* But this is to deny daylight at Noon day: For (m) *Annonius* is most clear in it, and (n) *Abbot Vspergens.* (o) the Book of *Charles* the Great saith the same. The Synod of *Frankford* was convened *An.* 794. of purpose to condemne the second Synod of *Nice*, called the seventh pretended and false Synod: (p) *Aventinus* saith expressly, *Scita Grecorum* (in Synodo Nicena decreta) *de imaginibus adorandis in concilio francofurtensi rescissa & abolita sunt*: and (a) *Vspergensis* saith, in this Synod it was decreed, *Ut septima & universalis Synodus, nec septima nec aliquid diceretur, quasi supervacua ab omnibus abdicatu est*; and the same saith (b) *Eginradus*, (c) *Geo: Cassander*: But the very Arguments in the Nicene Councell are set down, and dissolved in the *Frankford* Councell, as our own Master (d) *Simson* observeth: As the Nicene Councell reasoneth from the *Cherubims*, and the brazen Serpent. *Frankfoord* Answereth, *These were made at Gods Commandment, images not so.* 2. Yea, say they, and with them (e) *Lorinus*, The Cherubims and *brazen Serpent were not made to be Worshipped*; see these and many other Arguments, set down and Answered by the *Councell of Frankfoord*: As also saith (f) the Learned Author of *Catol. Test. Verit.* The Arguments used by this Councell, proveth that no Adoration is due to Images, as may be hence collected: As also out of the book of (g) *Charles* against the dreames of *Tarasius*, whose entry to the Priesthood was unlawfull, and was a grosse Idolater, and against the Idolater *Pope Adrian*; Because 1. *There is no holinesse in images, either as they are figures or colours, or as they are Consecrated,*

e *Bellarm.* de Imag. l. 2 c. 14.
f *Suarez* in 3. part. *Thom.* q. 25. art. 3. dis. 54. Sect. 3.
g *Sanderus* l. 2. de Imag. c. 5.
h *Alanus Dial.* 4. c. 18.
i *Naucle.* in Chron. Vol. 2. gener. 27.
k *Sabellicus* l. 8. Enead. ad. 8.
l *Blandus* decad. 2. l. 1.
m *Annonius* in Annalib. *Francorum.* 794. *Anno.*
n *Abbot. Vspergens.* in Chron. *Anno* 793.
o *Charles* the Great, of Images.
p *Aventinus*, lib. 4. annal.

a *Vspergens.* in Chron. *Anno.* 793. b *Eginradus* in vita Caroli Magni. c *Cassander* in Consul. ad ferdinand. & Maxmilian imp. d *Simson*, Treatise of Images, pag. 48. e *Lorinus* in Art. 17. ver. 25. *Serpentem. Conflari jussit non quod adorari vellet, nam postea confregit.* f *Catol. Test. Verit.* lib. 8. pag. 883, 883, 884. g *Caroli.* lib. 1. cap. 2.

2. *Be-*

2. *Because to Adore is to glorifie,* [h] *but only God is to be glorified.* 3. *God Commanded us not to love images, but men, and sent his son in the flesh for men, and not for images; and if* [i] *they be not to be believed on, neither are they to be Adored.* 4. *It cannot be proved that the honour of the image, is the honour of the Samplar: Christ* said not, *What ye do to images, ye do to me, nor he that receiveth images, receiveth me.* This Argument proveth, that Veneration is not due to the Images, as to books of the Trinity; because that the Veneration of the Image, is an honouring of God, there must be an union betwixt the Images and God or Christ, betwixt the Tree and Christ. 1. There is no union lawfull, that can be a Warrant of honouring any thing; but an union Warranted of God, betwixt *Crossing in the Air, and Dedication to Christs Service*, betwixt *Surplice and Pastorall Sanctity*; There is no union, nor is there a personall union betwixt Christ and the Image: Nor 2. an union of parts, as betwixt the shoulders and the head. Nor 3. is there a Divine relative union, as betwixt the mean or the end, the Servant or the Lord: for as [a] *John White* saith well; and [b] the Scripture proveth, all union betwixt God and the meanes of Worship, which are to be reverenced as meanes of Worship in relation to God, is by divine institution; now certainly if by divine ordination there had been an union betwixt the Image and God, then had it been lawfull to lay the Image in the heart, to say: *How love I thy Image?* (*the painted pictures and wooden portracts of Christ, the wood of the Crosse are my delight*) (*I hope in the wood*) (*I have taken images for my heritage, they are sweeter to me, nor the honey or the honey combe*) (*how pleasant are the wooden feet of these dead and senslesse Ambassadors of Christ, who bring to my soul news of God, or of my Redeemer Iesus.*)

(c) Ambrose, [d] Gregorius, [e] Augustine [f] Chrysostom saith, *The honour of the servant redoundeth to the Master, when he is a servant by appointment of the Master, and he that heareth faithfull Pastors, heareth Christ who sent them:* And [a] *Athanasius*, and [b] *Basill*, to prove the honouring and adoring of Christ, the substantiall Image of God, to be the honouring of God the Father, say; *The hearing of the Image, or of the servant of the King, is the hearing of the King.* But the Image is formally made an Image of God, and the saints by mens imagination, not by Gods word or his ordi-

h *Carlo.* lib. 1. c. 21.
i *Caro.* lib. 2. cap. 24. *Caro.* lib. 3. cap. 16.
(a) *White* against *Fisher*, p. 224.
b *Matth.* 10. 14, 42. 2 *Cor.* 8. 4. *Gal.* 4. 14. *Act.* 10. 34. *Ps.* 119. 97. 159. 147. 82. 103. 111. 113. 114. 120. 127. 128. 140. 143. 167. 174.
c *Ambros.* epist. 26.
d *Gregor.* in reg. l. 5. cap. 1.
e *Augustine* on these words, he that receiveth you receiveth me.
f *Chrysos.* on these same words
a *Athanas.* cont. Arria. orat. 4.
b *Basilius* de spir. sanct. cap. 18.

ordination: Their own [c] *Peresius* saith, *If the imagination were carried upon the image or samplar with one motion, yet it cannot be concluded, that the same is to be done in Adoration*: And [d] we are not to worship God by our fantasies, saith *Augustine*, nor by our (e) carnall thoughts. *Suarez*, *Bellarmine*, *Vasquez*, *Gretserus*, buildeth all their Adoration of images, upon the saying of *Aristotle*, *De memor & remiscen*, cap.2.

Hence the (f) Fathers of *Trent*, (g) dreaming *Damascene*, (h) doting *Nicephorus*; if we believe (i) *Suarez*, make this a principle of their Bible of Idoll worship; *That God and the Image are one*, but we see not how they be one, nor can we say that God is present in the Image as in a place: for if he be present in the Image, *In loco ut sic*, as in such a place, then he is there as in a consecrated place, and by promise, and so they must give us the word of God, for Gods presence in Images; but if God be present in Images, as *In loco simpliciter, non ut in loco ut sic*: As he is in all places, then is he not present in images, as in images, but as in all creatures, and then let us say Amen, to (k) *Vasquez*, who saith, all things which have a being, *A Mouse and Frog are to be adored, as having resemblance with God the first being*: And he saith, this is the opinion of (a) *Cajetanus*, and citeth (b) *Leontius* the dreamer, who was at the Councell of *Nice* the seventh false Synod; who saith, all Creatures visible and invisible are to be adored. And the Popes Professor (c) *Joannes de Lugo* proveth by four great reasons, that all creatures should be adored.

God not in the Image as in a place.

Vasquez will have all things to be adored.

Joan. de Lugo proveth the same by four reasons.

1. *Because all creatures are the effects, and as it were the hand writing of God.*

2. *Because we use to kisse and adore materiall places, and the stone, or field where an Angel, or Saint hath been, for the touching and propinquity of the place and that holy thing, but Gods omnipresence sanctifieth all creatures.* Be doing then, Masters, kisse, and adore the sanctified Devil and Hell fire, but take heed you scald not your lips.

3. *We kisse and worship a gift of a Prince, but all creatures, even the most abject and contemptible, are the gifts of God the Creator.*

4. *Man in a Speciall manner is the living image of God.* But true it

e *Peresius Aiala* in *Trad.*3.de imag.
d *August* de vera relig.cap.55.
e Idem epist.85.
f Conc. Trident. Sess.25.
g *Damascen.* l.4.c.12.
h *Nicephor.* in dial. constant.de imaginibus
i *Suarez* in 3. part Thom.to. 1.q.25.art. 3. disp.54. Sect.3.
k *Vasquez* in 3. part tom.1.disp. 110.cap.2.

a *Cajetan.* 22. q.103. art.3. ad.4. b *Leontius* in Dialog. 5.cont. *Judæos. Ut refertur* in 7.Synod. *falsa* act.4. c *Joan. de Lugo* de myster. incarnat. disp.37. Sect.1. n.1.2,3.

is

is, God is to be praiſed for all his creatures; but externall Adoration before them, and laying a part of Gods glory upon them, for that is forbidden by your own, for (d) *Leo* the firſt ſaith the contrary, and [e] *Salmeron* ſaith; *The body of* (f) *Moſes was hidden of old for fear of Idolatry*, and the uſe of Images and pictures were by God forbidden to the Iews in the ſecond command, ſaith [f] *Alexander Alenſ.* (g) *Albertus*, [h] *Bonaventura*, [i] *Martinus de Ajala*, [k] *Abulenſis*, who I am ſure have with them in this, *Albertus* and *Bonaventura*, that the Images of God, becauſe (ſay they) he is an invifible Spirit, are forbidden by the Law of nature.

But I return to the Synod of *Franckeford*: 5. (l) *Becauſe images are void of ſenſes and reaſon.* 6. *It cannot be proved by the example of the Apoſtles*, [m] *Ergo*, (ſay I) Images are neither to be teaching books, nor adored creatures: 7. *The ancient Fathers* [n] *were ignorant of this worſhip.* 8. *Only the rich* [a] *who are able to ſuſtain Images, ſhould be ſaved, and not the poor.* 9. There [b] is no profit, but great vanity in adoring Images.

To the Arguments from miracles it is anſwered, [c] that theſe miracles are lying ſignes: for, *Ea miracula, nulla Evangelii lectio tradit.* 2. They deny that all things are to be adored, in the which, or by the which [d] God wrought miracles. *Gregorius Nyſſenus* bowed his knee to the Image of *Abraham*: What then? the Councell ſaith, theſe books of *Nyſſenus* are periſhed.

The fable of *Agbarus*, to whom the Image of Chriſts face painted in a cloath was ſent, was not in the world till the year of God, 700. It is a counterfeit work aſcribed to *Athanaſius*, in ſtile and phraſe of writing not like to him, where it is ſaid, that it was the image of Chriſt crucified by the Iews in *Berythus* a Town in *Syria*, out of whoſe ſide flowed blood and water, which being mixed with water, could cure all diſeaſes; (e) ſo *Symſon*.

The Teſtimony [f] of the Councell of *Eliberia* is clear, that images ſhould not be in Churches (g) *Canus*, (h) *Surjus* and your own men ſay, this Councell condemneth images. For 370. years

d *Leo.* 1. Serm. 7. *De nativitz abſtinendum ab ipſa ſpecie officij.*
e *Salmeron* in 1 *Tim.* 2. diſp. 8.
f *Alex. alen.* 3. p. q. 30. memb. 3. art. 3. ſect. 1.
g *Albertus* diſt. 9. art. 4.
h *Bonavent.* art. 1. q. 2. *ad* 1. *in contrarium.*
i *Martinus de ajala tract. de trad.* 3. par.
k *Abulenſ.* Deut. 4. q. 4 & 5.
l *Carol.* lib. 2. cap. 25.
m Ibid.
n *Carol.* l. 4. cap. 27.
a *Carol.* l. 4. cap. 27.
b *Carol.* l. 1. cap. 21.
c L. 4. c. 10.
l. 3. c. 21.
d L. 3. c. 25.

e *Symſon* treats of the worſhipping of Images, pag. 50, 51. f *Concilium Eleberia*, cap. 36. *Placuit in Eccleſiis picturas, non eſſe debere, ne quod colitur, aut adoratur, in parietibus pingatur.* g *Canus* line 5. cap. 4. h *Surjus* 1 Tom. of concell. an in can. 36. cont. Eliber.

there

there were no Images in Churches; in this age Martyrs were admired, and the *Grecians* first, especially *Gregorius Nyssenus* the brother of *Basilus* had Images in Churches; (i) *Sozomen* saith, Christians took into Churches pieces of Christs image, broken by *Iulian* the Apostat, in the first age, when Religion was born down and holy Pastors killed.

(i) *Sozomen* l. 5. c. 20.

Gregorius Magnus first defended that images should be in Churches. Its like the Apostate *Iulian* would hate any thing, bearing the name of Christ most falsly, yea, and Antiquity beareth contradictions most aparent touching images.

But (*b*) *Nicephorus* saith, the creatures of God are the Lawfull Images of God. But it is more then evident, by what I have said, that ancient Papists and Synods used images to be memorials of God, and not to be adored.

b *Nicephor* hist. l. 11. cap. 43.

CAP. II. QUEST. I.

Whither kneeling or sitting be the most convenient and Lawfull gesture in the Act of receiving the Sacrament of Christs Body and blood?

1. *Conclus.* SItting is the most and only lawfull gesture, That gesture, that Christ and his Disciples used upon morall and unalterable grounds, which doth not concern the first Supper as first, but as a Supper, and that not upon no occasionall and temporary reasons, belonging to that Supper, more then to all the Suppers of that kinde, that we are to follow as a pattern, and must be most Lawfull. But the gesture of sitting is such, *Ergo*:

The *Proposition* is evident in Scripture, (*c*).

c Prov. 2. 20. Eph. 5. 1. 1 Thes. 1. 16. 2 Thess. 3. 6, 7. 1 Cor. ii. Phil. 3. 17. 2 Tim. 3. 4.

I prove the *Assumption*. 1. Sitting was either: 1. *Miraculous*. 2. *Customable*. 3. *Occasionall*; or 4. *Morall*. None in reason can say the first, that sitting was a miracle: 2. Nor is it *customable*. For 1. Customes laudable are grounded upon decency and reason, and so morall, or grounded upon no reason at all.

But *Christ* did nothing in *Gods* worship, nor did he any humane morall actions for the meer fact and will of others going before, for these were not reasonable humane actions, and if it be customable only, it is not lawfull to put away a customable action out of worship, and to put a morall action of kneeling and Divine signification,

Sitting the only convenient gesture.

tion in the place thereof, for so we might change places, times, persons and all physicall circumstances, and make them supernaturall. 2. The action could not be occasionall: for then the occasion of the Supper as first, and because of such persons, such time at night, such place, an upper chamber, should have moved Christ to sitting, rather then to kneeling, or to any other gesture: but kneeling or any other gesture might have consisted well with that first Supper, with the upper chamber, with the time and persons, as well as sitting, except the Lawgivers will had been a reason of the contrary.

Some object. *Christ choosed an upper chamber, not the Temple, twelve persons, not ten, not twenty, at night, for he might have celebrated it at dinner, but we are not holden to imitate Christ in these*; Ergo, *neither in sitting.*

Ans. Occasionall, properly is that which hath a reason, not from the nature of the thing it self, but from such occasionall occurrences of Providence, as God will not alter, and its that which hath no morall nor sacred conveniency with the nature of worship, but hath only a conveniency for such a time and place, as Christs preaching in a ship, when he is at the sea side, and a multitude are to hear him, the ship hath no agreement with the nature of preaching, more then an house hath, time, place, and persons are clearly such as agreed with that supper, as first, not as a sacred worship, and therefore were meerly occasionall, and so not imitable, and though Christ might have altered them, yet had they been occasionall, and they have no sacred conveniency with this Supper, as this Supper; and if Christ had altered these for meer will, upon no reasons that concerneth all Suppers, they had not been occasionall, but positive points of worship, and so had obliged us; yea, the upper chamber, and these twelve persons by no possibility, can concern all Suppers, to the end of the world, but sitting agreeth kindly and natively to all Suppers in generall, as kneeling to all praying indefinitely. Christ might have changed bread and wine, in flesh, and milk, or water, will it hence follow, we are not to imitate Christ in bread and wine? And that bread and wine are occasionall? Lastly, *Pauls* practise in passing from an upper chamber, and from twelve men, to a Church full of men and women, 1 *Cor.* 11.23,17,18,22. warranteth us to passe from these, we have not the like reason to warrant us to passe from sitting.

What is occasionall in the first supper.

2. *Arg.* 2. That gesture which Christ chooſed, and that refuſing all other, even kneeling, having the ſame Religious reaſons, at the firſt ſupper as now, that muſt be moſt convenient and lawfull. But ſitting is ſuch; *Ergo*,

The Propoſition is clear: The Aſſumption is proved from *Matth.* 26. *while they did eat* (the Paſſeover) *he took bread*, Mar. 14 22. *As they did eat, Jeſus took bread.*

Chriſt ſate at the firſt Supper. But while they did eat the Paſſeover, they ſate. *Ergo*, while they took the Supper they ſate: I prove the Aſſumption, Matth. 26.20. *And, When the evening was come, he ſate down with the twelve*, Mark 14.18. *And as they ſate, and did eat, Jeſus ſaid*, &c. *v.* 22. *And as they did eat, Jeſus took bread*: eating the Paſſeover, and ſitting were co-exiſtent, and taking the Sacramentall bread of the Supper, and eating the Paſſeover were co-exiſtent; *Ergo*, Taking the bread of the Supper, and ſitting were co-exiſtent.

Of kneeling, part. 2. pag. 54. *Paybodie* ſaith, *Paul* expoundeth, (*as they did eat*) after they had ended eating, and ſo after they had ended ſitting, and poſſibly paſſed to another geſture, 1 *Cor.* 11. *After Supper he took the Cup. Anſ.* If you wholly remove the Paſſeover, you remove the Table alſo. 2. Though the Suppers were not mingled, yet the holy Ghoſt expreſſeth the co-exiſtence of ſitting, and taking the Sacramentall bread, as *Ezech.* 8.1. *As I ſate in mine houſe, the hand of Iehovah fell upon me*, 2 Sam. 18 14. *Ioab thruſt three darts in him, while he vvas yet alive*, 1 Sam. 25.16. *The men vvere a vvall to us, all the time that vve vvere vvith them*, Dan. 4. 3. and Matth. 26.47. *And vvhile he yet ſpake, Lo, Iudas came*, Act. 10.19. *While Peter thought on the viſion, the ſpirit ſaid to him*, Act. 22.6. Rom. 5.10. If praying interveened betwixt eating and taking the Supper, and the Paſſeover ſitting, to put them to kneeling, this muſt be true, *vvhile they vvere not eating, Chriſt took bread*, a plain contradicting of *Chriſt*. 3. After Supper he took the cup, but they ſay not after Supper he took the bread, for praying, bleſſing, breaking, diſtributing, eating, interveened betwixt the Paſſeover and taking the Communion Cup, and therefore he had reaſon to ſay, *After Supper he took the Cup*, but not that reaſon, to ſay, after *Supper he took the Bread.* It is violent to deſcribe Chriſts taking the Bread from the adjunct of time, while as they ſate and did eate, if ſitting and eating were not at this time, but were gone and paſt by many inter-

interveening actions of kneeling, praying, preaching, this were to describe supper from dinner. 3. By this, the gesture of no Table action can be cleared from Scripture, for when it is said, *Luke 9. Iohn 6. He made the multitude sit downe and eate,* a cavillator might say, praying and blessing the meat went before, and possibly they sate on their knees, and *Christ sate downe and taught the people*; it may bee he rose and kneeled before Sermon was ended. The Scripture saith, *While Christ and his disciples did eat,* and so while they did sit, *he tooke bread.* This taking of bread, whether it be an *Hysteroſis* as many think, in respect the Evangelists mention but once taking of bread, or if it was preparatorie, and before the act of blessing, it was a sacramentall act performed by *Christ*, while they were sitting, which is much for sitting.

That *Christ* passed not from passeover sitting, to Supper kneeling, I thinke these considerations move me. 1. Because the changes of all in the Passeover, to that in the Lords Supper, as of flesh in bread and wine, is positively set down. 2. No question the change unto an adoring gesture, had been upon the grounds of conciliating more reverence to that Sacrament, then to the Passeover, which must be morall, and tye to the end of the world. 3. Nor would the Holy Ghost have removed an ordinary table gesture into so insolent, and supernaturally significant gesture, as kneeling, without a grave reason expressed, or his owne will onely, which is onely the essentiall reason, why bread is a Sacrament rather then any other Element, and so would stand of necessary and essentiall use. 4. Sitting at the Idols table 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. declareth that in religious feasts, sitting was ordinary, and a signe indicant of honouring the spirituall *Lord* of the Banquet, and a religious communion with the Lord of the Feast was hence signified.

But saith *Paybodie* ἀναϰλίδς and ἀναπίπτειν *Mat.* 26. 20. *Mark.* 14. 18. *Luke* 22. 14. *Iohn* 13. 12. *signifieth* lying, and *M. Lindsay* saith, it signifieth *prostration on the earth rather then sitting.* For Levit. 18. 23. *standing and lying are confounded, and* Calvin *expounded it so.* *Part. 2. Page 62.*

Ans. 1. *Christ* his reasoning to prove that ἀναϰλίδς to sit at meat is a greater honour, then to stand: *Luke* 22. 27. were null, if ἀναϰλίδς signifie prostration, for religious bowing is alwaies an act of inferioritie. The same I say if ἀναπίπτειν signifie falling downe

to the ground. 2. Sitting or pitching about a place, and sitting and lying in sackcloath, may well signifie simply to be in a place, but table-sitting and table-inclining on *Christs* bosome must be more then simply being at the Table. Nor doth *Calvin* in that place expound sitting at table, for nothing but simply being at table, though elsewhere he doth.

3. *Arg.* That which representeth the honour of table-fellowship of fellow-banquetters with *Christ*, that is of necessary use; But sitting at the Lords table representeth this; *Ergo*, *Luke* 22. 27. The Minor is made good, to teach the Disciples humility, he would stand and have them to sit. *Whether is greater he that sitteth, or he that standeth?* it is a greater honour to sit at table, then to stand; *Ergo* it is an honour to sit, for we may well infer the positive from the comparative, *Luk.* 22. 29. upon the occasion of their striving who should be greatest, and *Lord Bishop*, he promiseth a sort of fellowship in a Kingdome. 2. In sitting on thrones with him, and the meaning that that fellowship should quench the fire of their appetite for Prelacy. 3. This sitting in Scripture, as table-sitting, is used to expresse our fellowship with *Christ* in the Gospell, *Mat.* 22. 1. 2. *Luke* 22. 30. *Mat.* 8. 11, 12. *Luke* 14. 15, 16, 17. *Cant.* 1. 12. *Cant.* 5. 1. *Rev.* 19. 9. *Rev.* 3. 20. and our Communion with *Christs* body and his blood is sealed up in this Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 4. This is confirmed, in that the Sacramentall food is not simply given as food, (though that be a speciall fruit thereof) for then there should be no more required to the essence and integrity of the Supper, but eating and drinking, and on his alone, eating and drinking and using the words of *Christ*, should receive a Sacrament, and the manner of eating should be accidentall, and in the *Churches* power; but this food is given as food Table-wise, with the solemnities of a banquet, and of spirituall fellowship, which must be represented of purpose here, and that sitting wayes, so to eat and drink with Publicans is a signe of fellowship, as *Christs* eating and sitting with Publicans and sinners made him be construed to be a friend to them, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. To refuse to eat with a fornicator, is to refuse fellowship with him, 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. 1 *Cor.* 10. 20, 21. *To sit at the Idols and Divels Table*, is to partake of the idoll and Satans worship, as having fellowship with them; *Ergo*, to sit at the *Lords* table is to have fellowship with him. 5. The Holy Ghost speak-

eth

eth this fellowship, *Luke* 22. 14. *He sate down and the twelve Apostles,* συν αὐτῷ with him, see a fellowship, *Math.* 26. 20. *He sate downe,* μετ τῶν δώδεκα, *with the twelve.* 18. And as they did eate (together at Table) *Marke* 14. 15. *Luke* 22. 15. *With desire have I desired to eat with you,* μεθ ὑμῶν, table-wise, as *ver.* 14. *Mat.* 26. 29. I *will not drinke,----untill I drinke it new* μεθ ὑμῶν. The words carry a resemblance of drinking with them the well of life, so *Augustine, Hilary, Musculus, Amesius* expoundneth them, so (as I take) he draweth them from 1. This materiall wine. 2. From Sacramentall tabling. 3. From this old fruit of the Wine. 4. From fellowship here in the Kingdome of Grace, to 1. New wine in heaven. 2. To heavenly tabling. 3. To new and everlasting wine. 4. In the Fathers Kingdome. Neither am I much moved with what *Paybodie* saith, *that our Saviour led the woman of Samaria,* from *Iacobs well to thirst for the water of life, yet is not, for that, Iacobs well made a type by divine institution.* I answer, this would have some colour, if Christ did speake of common wine, as he did speake of *Iacobs* Well, as of common water. But all the three Evangelists speake of Sacramentall wine consecrated by word and prayer, else Christs calling bread his body should not prove that bread were a signe of his body by divine institution, but onely we were to make that spirituall use of bread and wine, that we make of ordinary bread and wine at our houses. Formalists then must say that *Christ* speaketh of wine here as common, not as Sacramentall, which is absurd when Christ is expounding the Elements, in their spirituall signification, *Luke* 5. 22, 21. *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is* μετ' ἐμε *with me, on the table. Mat.* 26. 23. *Marke* 14. 20. If he had been kneeling or standing, (gestures unpossible for them then) he could not have his hand leaning on the table, and if he had not beene sitting table-wise, in a table-fellowship with *Christ,* then could not our Saviour have conveniently convinced the ingratitude of *Iudas,* as he doth. Now if Christ aime not to make *Iudas* his fault the greater, because *Iudas* and he sate at one table together, and that as an holy and Sacramentall table, he had in this no more argued *Iudas* of ingratitude, then any of the rest of the house who communicated not with Christ, because Christ and they did eate one materiall and ordinary bread together. And in this *Achitophel* was a type of *Iudas,* as *David* of Christ, and that not onely in this,

Sitting a signe of our co-heirership.

this, that *Achitophel* did eate bread with *David*, and so had a civill fellowship, but that they went together to Gods house, in company together, *Psal.* 55. 14. So had Christ and *Iudas* fellowship together, at that same Sacramentall table: And as tabling together signifieth civil fellowship, so must fellow-tabling at one sacred Feast signifie Spirituall fellowship together. 6. Giving and not granting that fellow-sitting together were onely a common honour, not a misticall honour by divine Institution, yet since to sit at a table with a Ruler, is an honour, 1 *Sam.* 20. 5. 2 *Sam.* 9. 13. *Esther* 7. 7. *Prov.* 23. 1. *Mat.* 8. 11. *Luke* 16. 23. *Luke* 22. 30. And the Lords Disciples are admitted to sit with him, as is cleare in that *he sate down with the twelve*, and *he sate* (*Luke* 24. 30.) *at meat with them, and tooke bread and blessed it.* No power on earth should dare to deprive the people of God of this honour, for this honour was bestowed on the Lords Apostles, as communicants, not as Apostles, and the want of Christs bodily presence, diminisheth nothing of the honour, seeing he is really, but in a spirituall manner present, as the Lord of the feast, with us, as he was with them. *Paybodie* saith, *When Christ sate at table in the Passeover, even then he schooled them from looking at honour in materiall or outward sitting, while as Luke* 22. 26. *he would stand himselfe as a servant, and wash his Disciples feet.* *Answ.* His non-sitting and washing their feet, being a morall, not a Sacramentall teaching them humility, doth no more schoole them from not looking to sit, then his non-eating, and non-drinking while he stood servant-like, doth schoole them from not looking to the honour of eating and drinking Sacramentally. Christ teacheth lessons of humility, not to learne us not to seek the spirituall honour of communion with Christ, that were to teach us to be proud, and this man is that bold to insinuate that it was a spece of pride, for the Disciples to sit at table with Christ, and for *Iohn* to leane on his bosome.

Part 2. *pag.* 187.

Mr. *Paybodie* thinketh to crush this argument; *Because the serving of God the Father and giving him glory, must be incompatible with a table-fellowship with his Sonne. The disputer* (saith he) *reasoneth thus*; *Kneeling importeth an inferiority, therefore it is contrary to the person of co-heirs, which person we act by table-sitting, but do you* (saith he) *dream of a co-heirship, whereby you stand not in an inferiority to Christ, then when you take on you the person of co-heirs by*

Paybodie p. 268. 269. Disputer against kneeling, Arg. 1. c. 6.

sitting

sitting at Table, it were not lawfull either to esteem, or in a short ejaculation to call Christ your Lord and Superiour; yea so faith must have no working at the Sacrament: for Faith importeth an inferiority and dependance: We respect Christ in his banquet, as a King inviting us to eat with him; yea, I may kneel and call God my Father, and in so doing, I actuate the person of a co-heire.

Ans. But in this the disputer and we mean no other thing, then that kneeling which is a note of submission, and never used in banquets, cannot formally expresse, as an apt signe, the dignity of fellow-table-ship with Christ: 2. Poor Logitian, it followeth not in sitting at table, which is the expressing signe of the honour of table-fellowship, we may not call Christ, *Lord*. *David* sitting at Table with his Prince *Saul*, might well term him (*my Lord the King*) but if *David* should be put to his knees at Table, and inhibited to eat at the Table, at which his Prince did eat; no wise man will say, that *Saul* had honoured *David* with fellow-Tabling with him. For the Act of kneeling, and non-eating were no expressing signes of fellow-Tabling, but by the contrary of no fellow-Tabling; the Disputer hath no minde to make us every way equall with Christ, so as there can be a case, wherein it is not Lawfull to esteem or call *Christ* our *Lord*, King and Superiour, this is *Paybodies* consequence; but take away Table-sitting, an honour put upon us by Christ in this Sacrament, *Luk.* 22. 27. and substitute kneeling for it, then you take away Gods expressing signe of Table-Fellowship in that gesture: for while the world standeth, kneeling shall never be a signe of Table-fellowship: sitting at Table is a signe, as the Scriptures clear, but sitting taketh never away our inferiority to Christ; you may worship and actuate the person of a co-heir, but not worship in an expressing visible signe of co-heirship, and then kneel. Farther he reasoneth with us, as if Table-sitting inferred an equality betwixt us, and that Lord who is the head of men and Angels; we reason for an honour of fellowship, not equality. *David* set at King *Saul's* Table, is not made equall with *Saul*, but in Table-sitting, he doth partake of Table-honour to feast with his Prince.

A signe of our coheirship may well consist with our inferiority in worshipping Christ

If Christ should have sitten and caused his Disciples rise and wash his feet, in that he could not have said, (*I have put the honour of Table-fellowship on you, for you stand and wash my feet, and I sit*) this (I say) had been no table-honour, but most contrary to it: It had been

been indeed ſervant-honour, *Luk.* 22.27. and more then ſinfull men are worthy of. To kneel to Chriſt is an honour, but to kneel at Tabling with him, as kneeling, is no more an expreſſing ſigne of table-honour, nor ſtanding and ſerving Chriſt, while he did eat is an honour of table-fellowſhip. Now if any ſhall take away eating with Chriſt, at that table, he taketh away table-honour, as Papiſts do in taking away drinking with *Chriſt* from the people, yet eating with Chriſt maketh us not equall to Chriſt, but take away eating, and you take away Table-honour, ſo take away ſitting at Table, and you take away (*eatenus*) in ſo far the Table-honour.

But by this mean (ſay they) *you make it neceſſary to ſit, and of Divine neceſſity.* I anſwer, Table ſitting is not ſo neceſſary, as that the want thereof doth annihilate the Sacrament, and make it to be no Sacrament at all, but it is (as I think) many wayes neceſſary, as firſt it is morally or Theologically neceſſary, as being geſture ſanctified by the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, upon Morall grounds, and ſo to be imitated by us: 2. It is neceſſary, by neceſſity of expediency, as free from hazard of Idolatry, of which crime kneeling in this act, is guilty. 3. It is neceſſary, ſacramentally, for the integrity of the Sacrament, as ſignifying our honour of Table-fellowſhip. 4. It is by natures grounds neceſſary, that as this banquet is materiall, having bread, wine, taking, breaking, diſtribution, eating, drinking, ſo the externall ſolemnity of a banquet, ſuch as
4. *Arg.* is table-ſitting, requireth the ſame. And 5. which is our 4. Argument, it is neceſſary by neceſſity of Divine precept (*Do this in remembrance of me*) that this is included in the precept we certainly believe: 1. Becauſe nothing in reaſon can be excluded, from the precept of the firſt pattern, but what is meerly occaſionall, ſuch as ſitting is not.

2. The practiſe of Chriſt and the Apoſtles cannot be a will-action, and therefore muſt fall under a precept: ſitting cannot be occaſionall, upon the reaſon that it was continued through occaſion of the paſſeover; for if this be good, then eating and drinking, and the Analogy betwixt the ſigne and Chriſt, ſhall be occaſionall, and the ſinging of a Pſalm, as was at the Paſſeover, ſhall be occaſionall: for Chriſt retained what did equally belong to the Supper of the Iews, and this Chriſtian Supper, as concerning the common nature of ſacred Feaſts.

5. What

5. What is proper to a table of solemn feasting, should not be denyed to this, But fitting was such; *Ergo*, More of this may be seen in the Nullity of *Pearth* examination, and the re-examination of the five Articles of *Pearth*.

Quest. II.

Whether humane Laws binde the consciences are not?

Arg. 8. OUr Argument against Ceremonies is, that they fail against the fifth Commandment, and the Authority of Rulers. Ceremonies fail against the authority of Rulers.

What the Civill, or *Church-Ruler* can command must be good, necessary, apt to edifie, and not indifferent, or neither good nor evil; Ceremonies are acknowledged by their Fathers to be indifferent, and neither good nor evil; *Ergo*, They are such as cannot be lawfully commanded. The Proposition is clear; the Ruler must command for good, *Rom.* 13.4. *He is the minister of God for thy good*, and *all for edification*, 1 *Cor.* 10,23. 1 *Cor.* 14.3. *v.* 12,17,26. And therefore all means injoyned for this end, *good*, and *Edification* must conduce thereunto of their own nature, and not by the will of men, else they edifie not. But that this may be further cleared, it is questioned, if hnmane Lawes binde the conscience: for which consider,

1. Dist. *An humane Law is taken* in Concreto, *when judges command what God commandeth, as when they make a Law against murther.* 2. In abstracto, *when the judge forbiddeth what may tend to murther, as carrying Armour in a City in the night.*

2. Dist. *There is some morall equity in right humane Laws.*

3. *Something positive.*

4. Dist. *There be four things to be regarded in humane Laws*: 1. *Publick peace of the society.* 2. *The credit, honour and Majesty of the Ruler, even when the Law is unjust.* 3. *Obedience passive, and subjection, by patient suffering.* 4. *Obedience active by doing, which is now to be considered.*

Dist. 5. *An humane Law Civill may oblige*, Ratione generalis præcepti, *In regard of the generall command to obey our superiors, as the fifth Command* saith. *But the question is, if a humane Law, as meerly positive oblige in conscience, as if this which the Captain forbiddeth,*

biddeth, as, (not to speak the watch-word) be in it self against the sixth Commandment (Thou shalt not murther) if no murther follow upon the not speaking of the watch-word, though it be against the fifth in the generall.

Dist.6. The question is not, whether we be obliged in conscience to obey superiors in things Lawfull, or whether we be obliged in conscience to obey Superiors, when they are sole authoritative relaters and carriers of Gods expresse Law to us, for then they bring nothing of their own, to lay upon us, and in these cases their laws are rather Gods Laws delivered by Superiors to us, and binde the conscience. But the question is, if positive laws, in particular matters, negatively only, conform to the word, as in matters of *Oeconomy*, and *policy*, as not to eat flesh in Lent, for the growth of cattell; in matters of Art, and in ordering of war and Military Acts, commanded by Captains, if these commandments as such oblige the conscience. Now to oblige the conscience, is, when the not doing of such a thing bringeth an evil conscience; now an evil conscience, as *Pareus* (a) saith, *Is the sense of sin committed against God, and the fear of Gods judgement.*

[a] *Pareus* Com. in Rom.13. dub.v.5.

Distinct.7. *The conscience is obliged by doing, or not doing, two wayes:* 1. Per se, *kindly, when the fact of it self obligeth, and for no respect without, as to give almes to the poor at the Commandment of the superior:* 2. *When the fact obligeth for a reason from publick peace, good example, and order.*

1. *Conclusion.* When Rulers command, what God expresly commandeth, their Laws obligeth the conscience, *Psal.*34.11. *Come ye children hearken unto me, and I will teach you the fear of the Lord,* Prov.4.1. *Hear ye children the instruction of a Father.*

2. *Conclus.* Publick peace in all the commandments of Superiors, in so far, as can be without sin, obligeth the conscience, as *Heb.*12.14. *Follow peace with all men, and godlinesse,* Psal.34.14. *Seek peace, and follow after it,* Rom.12.18.

3. *Conclus.* Subjection to the censures of Rulers by suffering patiently, is an obligation lying upon all private persons, 1 *Pet.*2.20. *But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable to God,* Rom.13.2. *Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.*

4. *Conclus.* Nothing in non-obeying unwarrantable Command-

ments

ments must be done that redoundeth to the discredit of the Ruler or the hurting of his Majesty and honour, 1 *Pet.*2.17. *Honour the King, Eccles.*10.20. *Curse not the King*: For even when we deny subjection or obedience objective, to that which they command, yet owe we obedience officiall, and all due respect and reverence to the person and eminent place of the Ruler, as *Act.*7.2. *Steven* calleth them, *Men, brethren, and fathers*, Act.7.51. And yet stiffe-necked resisters of the holy Ghost.

5. *Conclus.* Humane Laws, whither civill or Ecclesiastick, in that particular positive matter, which they have of Art, *Oeconomy*, policy, and in Gods matters of meer humane coyne and stamp, do not bindes the conscience at all, *per se*, kindely and of themselves. 1. Nothing, but what is either Gods expresse word, or his word by consequence doth lay a band on the conscience of it self: *But not to eat flesh in Lent*, upon civill reasons, *Not to carry Armour in the night, To wear Surplice, and to Crosse infants in Baptisme*, are neither Gods word expresly, nor by consequence. The major is sure; becaus the word is the perfect and adequate object of matters of Faith, and morall practice, which concerneth the conscience, *Psal.*19.7.8. *Psal.*119.9. *Iohn* 20.31. *Prov.*8.9. 2. Because whatever thing layeth a band on the conscience, the not doing of that would be a sin before God, if the Ruler should never command it (*But the carrying Armour in the night* (*the not wearing Surplice in Divine service*) should be no sin before God, if the ruler should never command them, as reason, Scriptures, and adversaries teach. The Proposition I instruct from the diffinition of an obligation of conscience, for to lay a band on the conscience is defined, to lay a command on the soul, which ye are obliged before God to do, as you would eschew sin, and obtain eternall salvation: So the learned *Pareus* (*b*) so (*c*) Dr. *Field*; so [*d*] *Gerson*, and so teach [*e*] *Gregorius de Valentia*, and [*f*] *Suarez*. 3. None can lay on a band of not doing, under the hazard of sin, but they that can remit sins, for the power that looseth, the same bindeth: But mortall men cannot binde to sin, nor loose men from sin, but where God goeth before them in binding and loosing, for they cannot bestow the grace of pardoning sin: *But he onely who hath the keys of David, who openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth.* 4. Whoever can lay on bands of Laws, to bring any under

How civill positive laws binde not the conscience.

[b] *Pareus Com.* in Rom.c.13. Dub.7.
(c) *Richard Field* on the Church 4. book c. 33.
(d) *Gerson de vita spir.* part.3. lect.4.
[e] *Greg. de val. to.*1. disp.7. punct.6. Sect.1.
[f] *Suarez* tom.de legibus lib.3. cap.22.

the debt of sin, must lay on bands of obligation to eternall punishment, but God only can do this, *Mat.*10.28.

(h) *Aquin.* 22 q. art.1. ad. 3. (i) *Suar. Deoper. 6. dierum Tract.*3. disp.5. Sect. 1. num.2, (k) *Ferra. cont. Gentes* cap.21. (l) *Conrad.* 12. q.20. art.1.

The will of authority cannot create goodnesse in things.

The Proposition is clear, because sin against God, essentially includeth a relative obligation to eternall punishment. 5. In matters of Gods worship this is clear. The School-men, as [h] *Aquinas*, [i] *Suarez*, [k] *Ferrariensis*, [l] *Conradus* teach us, that there is a twofold good. The first is, *an objective and primordiall goodnesse*, whereby things are agreeable to Gods Law, if rulers finde not this in that good which they command, they are not just, and so not to be obeyed. There is another goodnesse that cometh from the will of authority, & so only divine authority must make things good; the will and authority of Rulers findeth objective goodnes in them, and therefore enacteth Laws of things, but because they enact Laws of things, they do not therefore become good and Lawfull, It is the will of the Creator of all beings which is the measure, rule, and cause of the goodnesse of things, as *Adams* not eating of the tree of knowledge is good and gratefull obedience, from Gods forbidding will, and it should have been as gratefull obedience to eat of that tree, if God had commanded so. Men cannot make worlds; nor can their will create goodnesse in acts indifferent, nor can their forbidding will illegittimate or make evil any actions indifferent, and therefore things must be morally good, and so intrinsecally good without the creative influence of humane Authority, and from God only are they apt to edifie, and to oblige the conscience in the termes of goodnesse morall.

(m) 1. F. *de constit. Princip. Quod Principi placuit, legis habet vigorem, est verum de placito justo.*

And this is strengthened, by that which in reason cannot be denied, to wit, that it is essentiall to every human Law that layeth any obligation on the conscience, that it be just, nor is it to be called a Law, except it be just, and justice and equity humane Laws have from God, the law of nature, and his word, not from the Authority and will of men; therefore Iurists expound that [m] *What pleaseth the Prince, hath the vigour of a Law*, of just things. Also the School-men, as (n) *Carduba*, [o] *Thomas*, (p) *Soto*, (q) *Medina*, r *Adrianus* s *Navar* t *Driedo* u *Castro*, as I gather out of their writings, give strong reasons, why Rulers cannot lay an obligation on the conscience, when the matter of the Law is light and naugh-

(n) *Carduba* in sum quest.18. part.1. (o) Thom. 22.q.104. art.6.

(p) *Soto de just.* leg. 1.4.6.art.4. (q) Medina.C.de *pœnitentia tract.*4. *de jejun.*c.7. (r) *Adrian quod.*6. art.2. (s) *Navar.* in sum.cap.23.num. 55. (t) *Driedo* l.3. *De liber Christ.* c.3.ad.5. (u) *Castro* lib.1. *de lege pœna.*c.4.

ty,

ty, for this were to make a man a trangreſſor before God, for a word, a ſtraw, a toy, which is unjuſt: Becauſe the juſt weight of the matter is the only juſt ground of the Laws obligation: *Ergo*, the will of the Lawgiver, except he make a moat a mountaine, cannot lay an obligation of neceſſity on man. 2. It were a fooliſh law, and ſo no law to oblige to eternall puniſhment, and the offending of 2. God for a light thing, for this were to place the way of ſalvation in that wherein the way conſiſteth not. 3. Such a law were not for edification, but for deſtruction of ſoules. 4. This was the *Phariſes* fault, *Mat.* 23. to lay on intollerable burthens on mens ſoules. 5. The law of God and nature freeth us in poſitive lawes from guilt, in caſe of neceſſity, as *David* did lawfully eat Shew-bread. 6. A Civill law may not take away a mans life for a ſtraw, farre leſſe can it bind to *Gods* wrath. 7. (x) *Auguſtine* ſaith, they be unjuſt ballances to eſteeme things great or ſmall, for our ſole will. Out of all which I conclude, that no law as a Law, doth oblige the Conſcience, but that which hath from the matter morall equity, and not from the intention of the Law-giver, as (y) *Cajetan*, (z) *Silveſter*, (a) *Angelus*, and (b) *Corduba* teach, which intention muſt take a rule from the matter of the law, and not give a rule. c *Gerſon*, *No law* (ſaith he) *is a law to be called as neceſſary to ſalvation*, (*as all good lavves ſhould be*) *but that vvhich* de jure Divino, *is according to Gods lavv*, yea, *vve are not* (ſaith (d) Durandus) *to obey the Pope if he command a Monke to doe ſomthing, vvhen he is not moved to command by the neceſſity, the profit of the Church, but by his ovvne free vvill, and if this be knovven.* If *the Pope* (ſaith he) *for his ovvne vvill, and vvithout neceſſity and utility ſhould ſeclude vvorkes of ſupererogation, that command ſhould tend to deſtruction, and vve are to obey Chriſt, vvho is above the Pope.* And therefore his mind is, that all obligation of Conſcience, in humane commandments commeth from Gods will and law, that is, from the juſt and neceſſary matter of the law, not from the will of men.

(x) *Auguſt. De Baptiſ. l. c. 6.*
(y) *Cajet. verbo præcepti tranſgreſsio.*
(z) *Silveſt. verbo præcept. q. 9.*
(a) *Angelus verb. lex. 11. 3.*
(b) *Corduba q. 189. part. 2. rat. 1. 2.*
(c) *Gerſ. de vit. ſpir. lect. 4. c. 7. Nulla lex ferenda eſt tanquam neceſſaria ad ſalutem, quæ non eſt de jure Divino.*
(d) *Durand. l. 2. d. 44. q. 5. numb. 6. Si Papa præciperet Monacho ea quæ ſunt contra ſuam profeſsionem, non motus aliqua neceſsitate vel utilitate Eccleſiæ, ſed ſola voluntate, & de hoc conſtaret, & Abbas præciperet, contrarium, obediendum eſſet Abbati, & non Papæ.*

6. *Concluſ.* All humane or Eccleſiaſtick lawes binding the conſcience, have neceſſarie, and not probable deduction onely, by the warrant of both the Major Propoſition and Aſſumption from the

Word

Word of God, and Law of Nature. This conclusion is against (e) *Suarez*, he seeketh onely a probable connexion betwixt obliging Lawes and the Divine law. And (f) *Gregorius de valent.* is in very deed against *Gerson*, who teacheth three things of all humane lawes. 1. That they are in so farre just. 2. That they in so farre oblige the Conscience, as they have necessary dependance upon natures law, or *Gods word*, and therefore compareth them to these precepts that Physitians give to sicke persons, they oblige the conscience of the sicke, (as I thinke) from the sixt Commandement, (*Thou shalt doe no murther*,) for if the patient sleepe at such a time, or drinke wine in such a case, he killeth himselfe, but they have not obliging power from the fift Commandement, not as if the King being sicke were obliged by the fift Commandement to obey the Physitian, as his superiour. 3. He will have all humane laws that properly obligeth, to be onely declaratory, and to manifest onely the Divine law, and to apply it to such and such a matter. The Conclusion is clear from what is said before, because all civil laws as meerly positive, in the case of non-contempt doe not oblige, and in the case of non-scandall, as (g) *Medin.* (h) *Almaine*, (i) *Gerson* teach. And it followeth from a sure ground, that (k) *Vasquez* layeth downe, and he hath it from (l) *Driedo*, to wit, that the efficacy of obligation in humane lawes, *cometh not from the will of Lawgivers, or their intention, but from the dignity or waightines of the matter.* If then the matter be not from Gods law, just, the obligation is none at all; for if the law from mans will, shall lay on an obligation of three degrees, whereas *Gods* law from *Gods vvill*, before men inacted this in a Law, laid on an obligation of two degrees onely, tying the Conscience, then the will of man createth obligation, or the obligative power of conscience in the matter of the Law, and by that same reason he createth goodnes, which is absurd, for that is proper to God onely.

I grant it is hard, because of the variety of singular actions in mans life, to see the connexion, betwixt particulars of humane lawes and Gods lawes; yet a connexion there is, and for this cause the learned worthy Divine, (m) *Pareus* will have humane lawes *in*

(e) *Suarez Tom. de leg. lib. 3. c. 24.*

(f) *Greg. de valent. tom. 2. disp. 7. q. 5. punct. 6. Sect. 1.*

Humane lawes oblige onely in so farre as they agree with the Law of God.

(g) *Medina tract. De jejunio cap. 7.*

(h) *Almain. Moral. c. 12.*

(i) *Gers. uti supra.*

(k) *Vasquez 12. disp. 158 c. 4. num. 32.*

Præcipientis intentio non facit præceptum habere majorem vel minorem obligandi, efficaciam, sed necesitas, dignitas, vel utilitas eorum quæ præcipiuntur.

(l) *Driedo de lib. Christ. l. 3. c. 3. ad 5.* (m) *Pareus* com. in Rom. 13. v. 5. Dub. 7. Conclus. 5.

parti-

particulari, & per se, in the particular and of themselves to binde the Conscience. Whereas (*n*) *Calvin*, and [*o*] *Beza*, *Iunius*, *Tilenus*, *Sibrandus*, *Whittakerus* and others deny this: But the truth is, humane civill lawes are two waies considered. 1. As they are meerly Positive & according to the letter of the Law. 2. As they have a connexion with 1. The principles of nature, of right and wrong. 2. With the end of the law, which is the supream law, *The safety of the people*, as the Civill law saith, *he who entreth to an inheritance and maketh no Inventory of all his goods, shall pay debts above the whole heritage*, this law according to the letter in the Court of conscience is unjust, and so cannot oblige in Conscience; so as he is guilty before God, and deserveth the vengeance of everlasting wrath, who doth not make an inventory of all his goods, and produce it to the Iudge; so he that goeth up to the walls of a City, may by the Law be commanded to be put to death, yet is he not guiltie of eternall death before *God*, and therefore if the presumption which is the ground of the law cease, as this; He that maketh not an inventory with a purpose to enjoy the whole inheritance and pay no debts, sinneth before *God* against conscience, as famous jurists, to wit (*p*) *Jason*, (*q*) *Bartolus* and others teach: for this Law considered as having connexion with a principle of nature, that every man should pay his debts, is a law binding the Conscience, and the truth is, the end of these Lawes oblige the Conscience, they being divine expressions of justice and righteousnesse, but not the Lawes themselves; for whatever obligeth the conscience as a divine truth, the ignorance thereof is a sinfull ignorance, and maketh a man guilty of eternall wrath, but men are not guilty & lyable to the eternal wrath of God, because they are ignorant of all the civill Lawes in *Iustinians* book; then were we obliged to be no lesse versed in all the civill lawes, that bindeth *in foro humano*, then of the Bible, and law of God.

The adversaries strive to prove that these lawes oblige the conscience, we may heare (*r*) *Bellarmine* (*s*) *Vasquez*, (*t*) *Valentinian*, and the Formalist and Arminian, (*v*) *Doctor Jackson* say, *To resist the Rulers in giving, and making lawes, is to resist God, as* 1 *Sam.* 8. *They have not refused thee, but they have refused me, that I should not raigne over them.* Suarez *saith, An humane law is the neerest cause of obligation of conscience, as the eternall law is the remote cause. And* Iackson *as the immediate interposition of divine authority*

(n) *Calvin inst. l.* 3. *c.* 19. *Sect.* 15. 16.

(o) *Beza in Notis in Rom.* 13.

A twofold consideration of humane laws.

(p) *Iason.*

(q) *Baldus in rubrica F. de acquirendis hereditatibus nu.* 23. *& seq.*

(r) *Bellarm. tom.* 1. *cont.* 5. *l.* 3. *c.* 11.

(s) *Vasquez tom.* 2. *in* 12. *disp.* 152. *cap.* 2.

(t) *Valent. tom.* 2. *disp.* 7. *q.* 5. *punct.* 6.

(v) Doctor *Iackson* on the Creed, lib. 2. cap. 4

authority made the killing of Abrahams sonne, holy, which otherwise would have been cruelty; so the interposition of authority derived from God, make some actions that barely considered would be apparently evill, and desperate, to be honest and lawfull; to strike a Prophet would seem sin, but when a Prophet cōmandeth to strike, not to strike is disobedience, 1. *Kin.* 20. 35, 36. *to rob a Spaniard is Piracie, but to do it upon the Kings letter of Mart for wrongs done to the State, is obedience to the King.* Answ. *To resist the servant in that wherein he is a servant, and as a servant, is to resist God,* as 1 *Sam.* 8. proveth well. But the assumption then is most false, for rulers in making lawes, and creating by their sole pleasure, goodnes morall, in particular matters without the word of God, are not Gods servants, nor is humane authoritie as humane, the nearest cause of obligation of conscience, instamped in these lawes, nor is it the cause at all, and therefore to resist them, is not to resist God. They be Gods instruments and Ministers in 1. Propounding and expounding Gods laws. 2. In executing them, and defending them from the violence of men. 3. In making positive and directory civil lawes, for civill government, that are lawes improperly so called, which bind the conscience as above is said, in so far, as they have dependance upon *Gods* Law: for *Iames* saith, *There is but one Law-giver.* As for *Church-canons*, all, except Physicall circumstances in them, are to be warranted by the word. Therefore it is a vaine consequence of *Valentia*, humane lawes oblige, *dependenter a lege æternâ, as they depend on the eternall law.* Ergo, *they oblige in Conscience*, it followeth not. They oblige in Conscience as their Major and Minor proposition, in that which is morall, can be proved out of Gods word, but so, in their morallity they are meerely divine, and not humane and positive, and so the argument concludeth not against us. They oblige in Conscience as they depend upon the eternall law, that is, as they are deduced from the eternall Law of God, in a Major proposition, without probation of the assumption, that we deny, and it is in question now. The people 1 *Sam.* 8. in rejecting *Samuel* from being their judge, rejected God, not because *Samuel* had a power of making lawes, without the warrant of Gods word. Neither *Moses*, nor *Jeremiah*, nor *Ezekiel*, nor any Prophet were in that servants subordinate to God, *for they were onely to heare the word at Gods mouth.* 3. We could have no more at *Bellarmines*

How inferiour rulers are subordinate to God in commanding.

(x) hand

(x) hand, then *Jackson* saith. For *Bellarmine* saith, *In a good sense Christ gave to Peter a power, to make that which is sinne, to be no sin, and that which is no sinne, to be sinne.* So *Iackson, the interposition of derived authority, maketh that which would be murther other wayes, to bee a good worke*; that is, men may doe what God onely can doe. If *Isaac* then at the commandement of *Abraham* his father, offer his sonne *Iacob* to *God* in a bloody Sacrifice, then *Abrahams* derived authority maketh that a lawfull sacrifice, as to strike a Prophet of it selfe, is a degree of murther, but when a Prophet commandeth another to strike a Prophet, it is lawfull. But can any blasphemer say, that this was humane derived authority without warrant of the word of the Lord, such as are humane positive lawes, and our humane ceremonies, see the text, 1 *King.* 20. 35. *And a certaine man of the sonnes of the Prophets, said unto his neighbour in the word of the Lord, smite me.* This was immediate, divine and Propheticall authoritie, and not humane. *Doth the Kings letter of Mart make robbing a Spaniard lawfull?* Court Parasites speake so, he refuteth himselfe. *The Kings letter of Mart, for wrongs done to the State, maketh that which is Piracy lawfull*, then the Kings authority doth not here by a nomothetick power, and a law laid upon the Conscience, but the wrongs of Piracy by *Spaine*, done to the State of *England*, may make the robbing of *Spaniards* an act of lawfull warre, and an act of justice flowing from the King as a lawfull Magistrate. Now *Iackson* is speaking of mandates of Rulers in that place, which have no warrant of the word of God. Yea, even *Stapleton* (y) a Papist saith, as Doctor *Field* also (z) observeth, That *humane lawes binde for the utility and necessity of the matter, and not from the will of the Lawgiver.* And so saith [a] *Gerson*, [b] *Almain*, [c] *Decius*, [d] *Mencha*, and our owne [e] *Iunius* saith, *The plenitude of power of lawes is onely in the principall agent, not in the instrument.* [f] *Doctor Iackson saith, unlimited and absolute faith or submission of conscience we owe not to rulers, that is due to God, but we owe to them conditionall assent and cautionary obedience, if they speake from God · suppose they fetch not an expresse commission from Scripture, for if Pastors be then onely to be obeyed when they bring evident commission out of Scripture, I were no more bound to beleeve & obey my governours, then they are bound to beleeve and obey*

(x) *Bellar cont. Barclai. cap. 3. Bono sensu Christus dedit Petro potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, & de non peccato peccatum.* Humane authority is not the neareast or instrumentall cause of Lawes.

(y) *Stapleton de statu Eccles. cont. 5. q. 7 art. 2.*

(z) *Field* on the Church, booke. 4. c. 33.

(a) *Gerson.*

(b) *Almain oper. moral. cap. 12.*

(c) *Decius nam concupiscen. lect. 1.*

(d) *Mencha quæstionum illustrium l. 1. c. 19. num. 1.*

(e) *Iunius animadv.*

in Bellarm. contr. 3. lib. 4. cap. 6. not. 89. (f) Doctor *Iackson* 16.

(g) *Sutluvius de Presbyter. c. 11. 65. Sic non magis Ecclesiæ & Synodo leges scribere & promulgare liceret, quam populo & subditis sibi leges condere præter sui principis & Magistratus voluntatem, si nimirum Christus esset externæ politiæ legislator.*

(h) *Bellar. de interp. verbi lib. 3. cap. 4.*

my Governours, ~~then they are bound to believe and obey me~~, for equals are obliged to obey equalls, When they bring a warrant from Gods Word, and so the power of Rulers were not reall, but titular, and the same doth [g] *Sutluvius* and [h] *Bellarmine* say.

Answ. We owe to equalls, to *Mahomet*, conditionall and cautionary faith and obedience; thus, I beleeve what *Mahomet* saith, so he speake Gods word, yea so Samaritans who worshipped they knew not what, *John* 4. 26. gave faith to their Teachers in a blinde way, so they speake according to Gods word. 2. It followeth in no sort, *if Rulers are onely to be obeyed when they bring Gods Word*, that then they are no more to be obeyed then equalls & Inferiours, because there is a double obedience, one of conscience, and objective coming from the thing commanded; And in respect of this, the word hath no lesse authority, and doth no lesse challenge obedience of Conscience, and objective, when my equall speaketh it in a private way, yea, when I writ it in my muse, then when a Pastor speaketh it by publike authority; for we teach against Papists, that the word borroweth no authority from men, nor is it with certainty of faith *to be received as the Word of man, but as indeed the Word of God*, as the Scripture saith: 1. There is another obedience officiall, which is also obedience of Conscience, because the fifth Commandement injoyneth it. Yet not obedience of Conscience coming from the particular, commanded in humane Lawes, as humane, so I owe obedience of subjection, and submission of affection, of feare, love, honour, respect, by vertue of the fift Commandement to Rulers, when they command according to Gods Word, and this I owe not to equals or inferiours; and so it followeth not that the power of Rulers and Synods is titular, because they must warrant their mandates from the Word. But its alwayes this mans hap to be against sound truth. But 3. That I owe no more objective subjection of conscience to this, (*Thou shalt not murther*) (*Beleeve in Iesus Christ*) when Rulers and Pastors command them, then when I read them in Gods word. I prove 1. If this from a Ruler (*Thou shalt not murther*,) challenge faith and subjection of Conscience of six degrees, but as I read it my selfe, or as my equall in a private way saith, (*Thou shalt not murther*) it challenge faith and subjection of foure degrees onely, then is it more obligatory of Conscience,

A double obedience due to Rulers, objective and subjective.

(i) 1 Thes. 2. 13. Isa. 1. 2. Jer. 1. 2. Ezek. 2. 7.

Objective obedience no more due to Rulers then to equalls.

and

and so of more intrinsecall authority, and so more the word of God when the Ruler commandeth it, then when I read it, or my equall speaketh it to me. This were absurd for the speaker, whether publike or private person, addeth not any intrinsecall authority to the word, for then the word should be more or lesse Gods word, as the bearers were publike, or private, more or lesse worthy. As Gods word spoken by *Amos* a Prophet, should not be a word of such intrinsecall authority, as spoken by *Moses* both a Prince and a Prophet. 2. My faith of subjection of Conscience, should be resolved, as concerning the two degrees of obedience of faith to the word spoken by the Ruler on the sole authority of the Ruler, and not on the authority of God, the Author of his own word. 4. I answer to *Sutluvius*, That Christ in the externall policy of his owne house is a Lawgiver, ordaining such and such officers himselfe, *Ezek.* 4. 11. commanding order and decency, and setting downe a perfect discipline in the New Testament, in all particulars that have influence, religious, morall, mystically significant in Gods worship, and there is reason that Synods and Pastors, should rather promulgate Gods Lawes, then the people. 1. Because God hath given to them by office, the key of knowledge. 2. Because by office they are watch-men, and so have authority of office to heare the Law at Gods mouth, and in Synods to give Directories or Canons according to that word, which people have not, and that their Canons must be according to Gods Word, is said in the word, *Nehemiah* 10. 32. *Also we made ordinances for us*, 34. *as it is written in the law of the Lord.*

Iackson saith, *Of things good in themselves and apprehended so by us, without any scruple of evil, every mans conscience hath sufficient authority to inioyn it, only the alacrity of doing in what time or measure it is to be done, or such circumstances, cometh within the subiect of obedience to governours.* Ibid. p. 259 260.

Answ. Then because faith in Christ is evidently good by the Doctors learning, the Pastor hath no more authority to command the people to beleeve in Christ, then the people hath to command the same to him. So in preaching all the necessary fundamentals of salvation, the authority of Pastors is meerely titular. There be then little necessitie of a publike Ministery, as *Socinians* teach us. 2. The alacrity and manner and measure of beleeving, and doing things evi-

evidently good is as particularly set downe in Gods Word, as obliging the Conscience, as the Mandates themselves, God who commandeth us to love him, and to beleeve in his Sonne, hath not left that power to *Prelates*, that createth wretched Ceremonies, to command us to love God with all our heart, or not, and to serve God with alacrity or not, or to beleeve in Christ with all the heart or with halfe a heart; the sincerity, measure and manner of the loving of God, is no more the subject of obedience to rulers then the loving of God. Rulers doe command both alike, *Pari authoritate*, except the man say that we obey Gods Law perfectly, when we give obedience to it, according to the substance of the acts, though we obey not sincerely.

False rules of obedience to Rulers proposed by Doctor *Jackson* refuted.

The Doctor giveth us Rules in obeying Rulers. *We are not to adventure on the action, whereof we are perswaded there be much evil, and no good in it.*

Ans. Then we cannot venture upon Ceremonies, that bringeth adders to Gods word, under all the Plagues written in Gods word.

2. Gods word, not mens perswasions of conscience (except in this also he be an Arminian) is the rule of mens actions. The servants of *Caiaphas* may be perswaded there is no good, but much evil in confessing Christ: We are to lay aside the erroneous perswasion, and obey, if the action be good in it self.

3. Rule. [a] *Hooker* Churchpolicy 5. book p. 197. 198. [b] *Suarez* de Relig. tom. 4. lib. 4. tract. 9. cap. 15. *Considerare, ergo aportet an secluso præcepto res sit, utrag; ex parte probabilis, & tunc universaliter verum erit, adjuncto præcepto, obediendum esse.*

Iackson. *Some actions apprehended as meerly evil, may be undertaken with lesse danger, then others which are apprehended, partly as evil, partly as good; the action is evil as long as we fear the evil in it, to be greater then the good we can hope for.*

Ans. To do any thing as apprehended evil, of which sort are humane Ceremonies to us, for any respect, is to do with a doubting conscience, and to sin, *Rom.* 14.23. 2. Gods word, not probabilities should lead us in adventuring upon actions.

Iackson. 3. *If the measure of the good apprehended, be as great as the evil feared; in private choice, we may adventure upon the action, leaving the event to Gods providence, which favoureth actions, more then privations; works rather then idlenesse, and following of that which is good, rather then abstinence from evil: for where this indifference of perswasion is, authority may cast the ballance, and sway the private choice?* so also (a) *Hooker*.

Ans. This is the Iesuit (b) *Suarez* his doctrine, and so saith the Iesuit

Iesuit of *Corduba* (c) *Sanches*, when the subject is in a doubt, whether the thing commanded by the Superiour be lawfull or not, he is obliged to obey, and he is to be excused because of the command of the superiour: 1. Because (say they) the Commanders condition is better, and for a speculative doubt, he is not to be spoiled of his power of commanding, where reason, saith he, commandeth nothing against reason: 2. Because the inferiour hath resigned his will to the superiour, *Deut.* 17. 2. *Paral.* 19. *Ergo*, In things doubtsome, God commanded to stand to the determination of the Priest, and it is a truth that the will of the Superiour doth not vary and change the nature of a thing in it self; yet it varieth to the inferiours conscience. Now indifference of perswasion is all one to Doctor *Iackson* with indifferency of the thing, for so he dictates. If one have indifferency of reasons of twelve degrees on both sides, that *Arianisme*, or *Arminianisme*, is truth, if authority determine both to be truth, the weight of authority in indifferency of perswasion should cast the ballance, and to believe this, or not to believe it: where Arguments are of twelve grains of light of truth on both sides, it is to the doubting man, as if the thing were indifferent, so is the doubter to give up his soul, conscience, and faith to believe *Arianisme* to be truth, not from light of conscience, (for equally as much light of conscience are in either side, as is supposed) but for the meer will of humane authority, without Gods word.

Now though the matter here be indifferent in it self, yet not so to the doubter; for Ceremonies in our perswasion are not indifferent. See here *Ignatius Loyola* (d) say, *Give over your self to your Ruler*. Give the Prelate your faith to keep, while ye be in eternity, and at the last judgement he will restore the pawn; And this is (saith *Gregory de Valent.* (e) to give your two eyes to your guide: I had rather they stick in my own head. To these Iesuits I oppose the minde of (f) *Vasquez*, and [g] *Salas*, who say in that case the subject should first lay aside his errour, and then obey. 2 God requireth a full perswasion by the Lord Iesus, even in things indifferent, *Rom.* 14. 14, 22, 23. But poor naked humane authority cannot ingender perswasion of faith; and here is doubting: 3. It is false, *That providence favoureth positive actions, more then privations*, for

[c] *Thomas Sanches Iesuita Cordubensis in Decalog.* tom. 2. l. 6. c. 3. n. 3. *Quado subditus dubius est an res præcepta, sit licita nes ne tenetur obedire & excusatur ab præceptum superioris.*

(d) *Ignat. loyola. cat. Iesuit* lib. 2. cap. 17. & 18. *Prudentia non obedientis, sed imperantis est Item non est dignus nomine obedientis, qui legittimo superiori, non cum voluntate judicum suum submittit.*

(e) *Greg. de Valentia.* to. 3. dis. 7. q. 3. punct. 2. *Subditus non suo judicio atq; authoritati nititur superioris.*

(f) *Vasquez* 12. q. 19. disp. 66. c. 9. num. 51. (g) *Salas* 12. q. 21. tract. 8. disp. unic. sect. 17. num. 152.

Rom. 14.

*Rom.*14. God loveth better abstinence from meats in themselves lawfull and clean, as the Apostle proveth, ver.14. *Because nothing is unclean of it self*, then that the eater doubt, if he be not transgressing the Law of God in eating, though a great Apostle say, there is no danger in eating.

The goodnesse of obedience to Rulers cannot countervalue the evil in the manner of doing with a doubting conscience and so sinfully.

And *Jackson* addeth of the same nature these; *The good of obedience is not a consequent only of the action, but either an essentiall part, or such a circumstance and motive precedent, as bringeth a new essence for its concomitant, whereby the evil, which we out of private perswasions fear, may be countervaled by the goodnesse that is in the purpose of sincere obedience to lawfull authority, as well as we conceited good probably included in the very object of the action, he that doth that which in his private opinion he suspecteth to be evil, because injoyned by lawfull authority, doth not evil that good may come of it, seeing the goodnesse of obedience is no consequent of the action, but a motive precedent---authority maketh actions indifferent to be good and necessary.*

Ans. He beggeth the question: *The goodnesse of sincere obedience to authority* (saith he) *may countervail the evil, that we in our private choice fear to be in the action.* But first, obedience to authority in things wanting Gods word (whereof he speaketh now) is not obedience, but sinning, because doing without faith. 2. I take the Doctor at his word, refusing obedience to mens will-worship, or to practise even to the ruin of the weak, things indifferent, for fear of the greatest evil, the offending of God, by adding to his worship, *Rev.*22.18,19. is obedience to God, and not a privation; the purpose (I say) of this obedience to God, may countervail all evil that can be imagined in non-obedience to men, and sure obedience to God, though probably obedience is as good and better, then obedience to men, though probably obedience.

Jesuites and *Formalists* say, Rulers are in possession to command; *Ergo*, We cannot thrust them out of possession, where we are not perswaded that they command against reason, saith *Sanches*: So I say, God is in just possession commanding us to venture upon no indifferent action, where the conscience doubteth, and shall we not no lesse contend for Gods just possession, as time-servers do for mortall Rulers unjust possession in this? 2. I prove that it were Lawfull then to sin against God: A Iew is alike perswaded, that *Maries Son is the true Messiah, and that he is a deceiver*: Opinions about

about a man, might seem indifferent to the Iews, *And it is all one* (saith *Jackson*) *as if the thing be indifferent.* Now the Pharisees in a Councell, determine, that *Maries Son is a deceiver*; Then it is lawfull for the Jew, *upon purpose of sincere obedience to Pharisees, who sit in Moses chair*, to believe, *that Maries son is a deceiver*; because the conceit of sincere obedience is an essentiall motive to transubstantiate unbelief into sincere obedience, and the Iew may venture upon the faith, that *Maries Son is a deceiver*, and crucifie the Lord of glory: being commanded thereunto by his Commanders, because *Gods providence favoureth more positive actions, then privations.*

3. He saith, *He that obeyeth for the sole authority of Rulers, doth not evil that good may come of it*: 1. Because the goodnesse of obedience countervaileth the evil of the actions: But 1. The question is, if it be obedience; *Ergo*, If it be no obedience, it cannot countervail the evil. 2. If it be the evil of sin, with a doubting conscience to do what judges commandeth, having no warrant of faith, but the will and lust of men, no purpose of good, though it were to save all the world, can counter-redeem the evil of sin against God. 2. *Because* (saith he) *such a one doth not evil, that good may come of it.* Then he that stealeth moneys to give to the poor doth not evil, that good may come of it, by Dr. *Jacksons* reason, *Because the goodnesse of purposing to help the poor is not a consequent, but a precedent motive of the action*, and so maketh it good: We all know, the intention of the end goeth in the intention before the action, but not as an essentiall cause to make an evil action good, or make an indifferent action necessary and honest: A good intention doth make a good action good and better, but that a good intention (as Idolators are full of good intentions) can never so season the means, as (this Doctor saith) that it can make evil to be good, [i] *Vasquez* condemneth the Fathers of ignorance, because they said, *Propositum bonum excusat malum opus*: so *Cassianus* (k) said, *It was lawfull to lie for a good end*, and (l) *Chrysostom*, and (m) *Ambrose* said the same, as *Vasquez* saith: see (n) *Aquinas* for this. 3. It is the doctrine of the man of sin, That Pope or Rulers, sole and bare authority can make an action indifferent, and so neither good nor evil, to be indifferent and good, as (o) *Bellarmine* saith; for God only by his institution createth morall goodnesse in actions; mans will

[i] *Vasquez* in 12. tom. 1. disp. 68. cap. 2.
[k] *Cassian.* collat. 17. cap. 17.
[l] *Chrys.* oper. imperf. *si ejus sit opus, homil.* 9. cap. 7.
[m] *Ambr.* lib. 1. de offic. cap. 30.
[n] *Aquin.* 12. q. 19. art. 7.
[o] *Bellar.* de Pont if. Rom l. 4. cap. 16. *Quicunq; potest præcipere, potest actum indifferentem suo præcepto facere necessarium, & per se bonum.*

will is no creatrix of goodnesse. 4. Neither resolutions nor skill are to be credited or followed, because private or publick, because authority of man as such, is no light nor warrant to the conscience to adventure upon morall actions; and the Lord giveth light to private men to obey, *Psal.* 25. 8 9. 1 *Cor.* 2. 14, 15. *Ioh.* 7. 17, 18 *Ioh.* 7. 27. 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. As he doth to Rulers to Command. So (p) *Sylvester*, (q) *Tartaretus*, so (r) *Rivetus*, (s) Doctor *Field*.

[p] *Silvest. in voce abrogat.*
[q] *Tartar. in moral.* cap. 5. & 7.
[r] Rivet. catho. orth. tom. 1. q. 9. tract. 2. q. 2
[s] *Field* l. 4. cap. 33.

I proceed to answer other Arguments: As 1. We must not obey, *Not only for Wrath, but for conscience, the violation of a speciall Law, necessarily draweth with it the violation of the generall Law of the fift Commandment; But the violation of the generall*, (saith Learned (t) *Pareus*) *hurteth the Conscience; and the Magistrate punisheth not for generall Violation, but for the Violation of this Speciall Law*; Ergo, *this Speciall Law obligeth in Conscience*. And it seemeth to carry reason. *Every just punishment presupposeth essentially a sin, else it is not a just punishment; but the Ruler doth justly punish the particular Transgression of an humane Law*; Ergo, *the Transgression of a particular Law of Rulers is sin*. The Proposition is confirmed by grave School-men, (u) *Soto*, (x) *Sylvester*, (y) and *Ioan. Eselius*, *Who thinke that there cannot be a Law obliging to a punishment, and not to a fault; because punishment hath an intrinsecall relation to a sin, nor can it be a just punishment that is not proportioned to a sin; for the Law* (z) *saith, That cometh not under damage, which cometh not under fault.*

(t) *Pareus.*
(u) *Soto* l. 1. de just. q. 6. art. 3.
(x) *Sylvest. Verbo in obedientia in fine.*
(y) *Jo: Eselius*, in expos. Decall. præcept. 4. cap. 36.
(z) Cap. 2. *De constit. Rem, quæ culpa caret, in damnum vocari non convenit.*

Other Arguments for the obligation of humane Laws Answered.

Ans. Though the Violation of the generall Law hurteth the Conscience, it being against the fifth Commandment; it followeth not that the Violation of every particular Law, even that that is meerly Positive, hurteth the Conscience before God: For then the carrying of Armour in the Night, Suppose no Ruler on earth make a Law there anent, should be a sin before God, which no wise man can say. 2. The other reason is more important, and draweth with it that School-question agitated by *Iurists* also and *Ganonists*, *An ulla detur lex pure panalis*; If there be a Law purely Penall, without sin in it: And if the Law of Rulers in things meerly Positive, be meerly Penall and co-active, and not formally obliging to sin. But I Answer, Rulers do justly punish the Transgression of a Positive Law, not as particularly humane and Positive: But as 1. It hath connexion with the Morall Reason of the Law. 2. As the particular

ticular transgression is scandalous and against order, in which case the formall object of the just punishment inflicted by the Ruler, is in very deed not the simple omission of the positive act of a particular humane Law, but the violation of the morall goodnesse annexed to it, and of the scandall given. Now in this meaning, the transgression of the positive humane Law is not kindely, *Per se*, of it self punishable, but by accident, and so it bindeth the conscience by accident; And in this sense, great Doctors, as (a) *Ambrose*, (b) *Anselme*, (c) *Theodoret*, (d) *Chrysostom*, (e) *Navarra*, (f) *Felinus*, (g) *Taraquel* say, That humane Laws oblige the conscience. But the most learned of the Canonists aver, that not to obey civill Laws, laying aside the evil of scandall, is no mortall sin, and so doth not involve the conscience in guiltinesse before God.

(a) *Ambros.* (b) *Anselm.* (c) *Theodoretus* in loc. Rom 13. (d) *Chrysost.* in Rom. 13. hom. 23. (e) *Navar.* in sum. cap. 23. numb. 54. (f) *Felinus*, cap. 1. de sponsalib. n. 18. (g) *Taraqu. Prefat de utroque retractu.* n. 74.

2. They object. *To resist the Laws of the Magistrate, is to resist himself; and to resist himself, is to resist the Ordinance of God.*

Ans. To resist the Laws positive and particular, in connexion with the morall reason of the Law, is to resist the Ruler, true. But so the question is not concluded against us: for by accident in that sense, humane Laws binde the conscience; but to resist the particular Laws, as particular Laws, as particular positive Laws, is not to resist the Ruler: A Ruler as a Ruler, doth never command a thing meerly indifferent as such, but as good, edificative, profitable, and except you resist the morality of the positive humane Law, you resist not the Ruler; yea, nor yet is the Law resisted.

What it is to resist the Ruler.

3. The Iesuit *Lod. Meratius* (h) objecteth: *Every true Law obligeth, either to guiltinesse, or to punishment, but the civill and Canonick Laws are Laws properly so called. But they do not ever oblige to punishment only.* Ergo, *They oblige to sin.*

(h) *Lodovi Merat.* par. 1. tract. de leg. disp. 1. Sect. 13.

Ans. It is denied that Laws civill or Canonicall, as meerly particularly positive, do oblige as Laws, or that they are Laws, they be only Laws according to the morality in them, that can promove us to our last end, eternall felicity.

It is also false that the Iesuit saith, *If thou wilt be saved, keep the Commandments*, doth command the keeping of all Civill and Canonick Laws, or that hence is concluded a Law obliging the conscience, that is, humane and positive, as if a *Lent Fast*, a *Pilgrimage*, and *not carrying Armour in the night* were commanded by *Christ*, as necessary to life eternall.

(i) *Merat.* ib. Sect.2.

The same (i) *Meratius* striveth to answer the Argument of *Almain* and *Gerson*, which is this; Who ever can oblige to sin mortall before God, he can inflict eternall punishment, but no mortall man can inflict eternall punishment.

1. Saith he, *This Argument would prove sins against the Law of nature, as homicide, and adultery, not to be deadly sins, for by the Law of nature, eternall punishment is not inflicted for sins against the Law of nature, but by the positive Will of God. If any say, God is the author of the Law of nature, because he is the Creator of that humane nature, in the which this law is written: So, if that be sufficient that the law of nature oblige under eternall punishment, so also the civill and Ecclesiasticall lavv shall binde the conscience, because he is the author of that power which maketh Civill and Ecclesiastick laws, for there is no power, but it is of God.*

Ans. 1. By the Law of nature, sins against the Law of nature deserve eternall punishment, and that essentially, laying aside the positive will of God, to whom I grant it is free to inflict punishment, or not to inflict, and this agreeth to all sin. But to carry Armour in the night, laying aside the case of scandall, and the morality thereof, that no murther follow thereupon, deserveth neither temporall nor eternall punishment. And if this Argument of the Iesuits hold good, no mortall sin shall oblige to eternall punishment, because Gods positive will is the neareſt cause of actuall punishment eternall in all sins. 2. God is not the Author of a propper nomothetick power in man, for that is the question.

2. He answereth, Distinguishing the Proposition. *None can oblige to a mortall sin, but he who can inflict the eternall punishment of a mortall sin. It is true* (saith he) *of the punishment which wholly dependeth upon the Will of the judge who made the Law: but it is not true of that punishment, which no way dependeth upon the Will of the Iudge, such as is eternall punishment, excommunication dependeth upon the vvill of man, and it obligeth to eternall punishment, yet man cannot inflict that eternall punishment: for a man may command an act, the omission whereof, or the commission whereof, is of such moment, that it serveth much for the good of a community, and therefore he vvho of knowledge and vvillingly doth such an act, doth sin against right reason, and so against the eternall lavv of God.*

Ans. 1. The distinction of the Jesuit is but a begging of the question

stion. *He who can oblige to mortall sin by his Law, can also oblige to eternall punishment, if eternall punishment depend wholly on his free will, as the Law doth*; What is that, but the inflicting of eternal punishment belongeth to him who maketh a Law obliging to sin mortal, so being the inflicting of eternall punishment belong to him; But our Argument is, he who hath dominion and authority to make a Law, hath dominion and authority to inflict a punishment answerable to the transgression of that Law: for it is one dominion and power to make the Law, and to inflict the penalty of the Law: Man cannot make the penalty of eternall wrath: *Ergo*, he cannot make a Law obliging to eternall wrath.

Why men cannot make laws that layeth a tye on the Conscience.

2. Excommunication is not done by mans will, but by the power of the keys for a mortall sin deserving excommunication, and so eternall wrath. If any Excommunicate upon his sole will, as wicked *Popes* have done; in that case the will of a man obligeth neither to punishment, nor to eternall punishment, it is but *Brutum Fulmen*, and not to be feared. 3. If any Commit an act that hurteth a whole Community, and is forbidden by men in Authority, he sinneth against the Law of God, though men had never forbidden that Act: And we deny not but humane Laws agreeing with the Law of Nature, doth oblige the Conscience both to sin and eternall punishment, but then they are not humane Laws, but Divine Laws, and in that case two guiltinesses, *Duo reatus*, are Committed, one against the fifth Commandment, in doing what Superiors according to Gods Word forbiddeth, and there is another guiltinesse against the matter it self, and a Divine Law, which also should stand as a sin before God, though the Ruler had never forbidden it: But if any carry Armour in the Night, being forbidden by the Iudge, for eschewing of night homicide, if no homicide follow at all, and the matter be not known, and so not scandalous, the carrier of Armour is involved in no guiltinesse before God.

Cap. III.
Of the power of the Magistrate in matters Ecclesiasticall.

Quest. I.

That Christ hath a spirituall Kingdom, not only in the power of preaching the word, but also in the power of the keys by discipline.

That Christ hath a spirituall kingdom, not only in the power of preaching the word, but also in the power of the keys, by discipline.

Concerning the *Christian Magistrate* we are to consider two heads, the one negative, what he cannot do in the matters of Christs Kingdom: 2. Positive, What he ought to do, for the opening of the former: We are to cleare whether or no all externall scandalls Ecclesiasticall, as well as civill, are to be punished by the Civill Magistrate; and that as in Civill scandals, that disturbeth the peace of the Common-wealth, the *Magistrate* hath a twofold power, one to command what is good and just, another to reward and punish; so the *Lord Jesus* in his Kingdom, hath not onely a directive power to teach and forbid, but also a power, by way of Discipline, upon the external man ecclesiastically to reward and punish, to binde and loose, in an externall Court on earth. It is granted by the Adversaries, that Christ as King hath a power of binding and loosing, but meerly internall, purely spirituall, in regard of the Conscience, by the Preaching of the Word; but for any externall power to take in and cast out of the Visible Kingdom of *Jesus Christ* his Visible Church, This they deny, and so refuse all externall Ecclesiasticall censures of receiving into the bosome of the Church, and casting out by rebukes, or Excommunication; and therefore that there is no externall Court in the Church to punish Ecclesiasticall scandals, all scandals and externall offences of the Church, are to be punished by the Christian Magistrate onely: In opposition to which error, I say,

I. *Con-*

1. *Conclusion.* There is not only a rebuking of an offender in the Church, by private admonition, as between Brother and Brother, common to all Christians, *Col.* 3. 16. *Levit.* 19. 17. And of the Pastor only, he applying the Word by way of Preaching to such and such offenders, and closing the Gates of the Kingdom of Heaven upon impenitent sinners, which is acknowledged by the Adversaries: But there is also a *Church-rebuking* by way of censure, which must presuppose an Ecclesiasticall Court, and a rebuking of a Publique sin, put forth by many; whereas one only, not a *Church* or multitude may Preach the Word, and so rebuke by way of Preaching, which I make out from the Word of God, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. *Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many*: The word ἐπιτιμία, a rebuke or punishment, in the old Translation, it is *Objurgatio*, in the Newer, *Increpatio*; Piscator *Muleta*, is a chastisement, whether this punishment was actuall excommunication, as many Learned Interpreters do not improbably gather out of the Text; or if it was a Rebuke of the Church in order thereunto: Certain it included, a rebuking not of one man, but a Church-rebuking inflicted by many, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. And by the Representative *Church of Corinth*, gathered together *with Pauls spirit and the power of the Lord Jesus*, 1 Cor. 5. 4, 5. And so presupposeth a Court or Convention of many inflicting this punishment. 2. The Adversaries who deny that there is such a thing as Excommunication, say it was onely a rebuke; but if it was Excommunication, it must include a rebuke coming from the many who do excommunicate. 3. It is such a rebuke as must be taken off and pardoned by many, as ver. 7. *So that contrariwise, ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him*, ver. 10. *To whom ye forgive any thing, I also forgive.* So here is a rebuking put upon an offender by many convened in a Court, who did rebuke by way of judiciall Authority, and the *power of the Lord Jesus*; *Ergo*, it was some higher censure which was inflicted by many, and taken off by many; then that which was inflicted by one by way of Preaching, where there is no necessity that many either rebuke, or comfort the rebuked: for one Pastor is to give out the sentence of Death or Life, rebuking and comforting, toward any one offender, or a person Repenting, whether many be convened to consent and joyn or not. Yea, I may, being a Pastor of *Jesus Christ*, dispense rebukes and comforts by way of Preaching, against

the

the will and minde of the whole flock: But a rebuke, and a forgiving by many, cannot be dispensed, except these many *convene together in the Name of the Lord Iesus* in a Church way and consent. 2. If the convened *Church* must be heard and obeyed when she rebuketh a Brother, for a fault done between Brother and Brother, and that upon the Testimony of two or three witnesses, then is the Church a Court that is to rebuke an offender, and so to convene him before her: and that is some other censure then by way of Preaching; but the former is true, *Matth.* 18. 16, 17. 3. If the *Churches of Ierusalem* and *Antioch*, convened in a Synod, do give forth an Ecclesiasticall rebuke on false Teachers, as those that *troubled the Churches, and perverted their Souls* with false Doctrine; then is there rebuking of offenders by a Church or Churches, beside a Pastorall rebuking by one single Brother or Pastor: But the former is true, *Act.* 15. ver. 24, 25. The Proposition is clear, in that a select company of *Apostles, Elders and Brethren*, doth not only Doctrinally conclude against their errour who did hold the necessity of Circumcision, but also against the Persons, and their Schismaticall way, of troubling the Church by a *σασις* in making a side and Faction in the Church, ver. 2.24. And this not any one single man could do in an ordinary way, except we say that it was an idle and unnecessary remedy which the Apostles used to quench the fire, as if any one man might have done all this, or as if they had rebuked these men publikely, not having heard and convinced them by the Word of God; or as if an offence touching conversation and against the second Table, had risen betweene Church and Church, no lesse then in the present case of an offence in matter of doctrine, that the Apostles would not have taken the same course, all which are not to be imagined. And in very deed this was not a point of meer doctrine, but also of peace and charity, violated by a Faction, *ver.* 2. And a scandall in eating things strangled, was raised *in the Churches*, *Acts* 15. 24. 1 *Cor.* 10. 28, 29. *Rom.* 14. 14, 15, 16, 17. 4. If *Timothy* be to *rebuke publikely, those that sin publikely*, and that judicially upon the Testimony of Witnesses. Then is there a publike Church-rebuking by way of censure, beside the pastorall rebuking. But the former is expresly said, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19, 20. This must be a rebuking in a Church-court, except we say *Timothy* his alone was the Church, and a Monarch

narch of the Church, who hath power to lead witnesses against Elders.

2. *Conclusion.* There is such a censure as excommunication in the hands of the *Church*, by which scandalous offendors are to be debarred from the society of the Church, and other holy Ordinances, that they do not prophane them, which is proved from *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17, 18. Thus, he who is to be of a brother esteemed as no brother, but as *a Heathen and a Publican*, and whose offence is bound in Heaven, as the Church bindeth on Earth, and that upon the testimony of Witnesses, he incurreth some other censure of reall ejection out of the society of brethren in a Church State, then Pastorall rebuking. But he who trespasseth against his brother, and will neither be gained by private admonition, nor by the Church rebuking him, is in such a case; *Ergo*, such a one is to be excommunicated, and so Christ must have instituted such a censure. That there is such a divine ordinance as Excommunication.

Divers reasons are alledged against this sense, as not favouring excommunication.

Object. 1. *If thy brother trespasse against thee, is, if thy brother trespasse against God, thou knowing him to be guilty, art to deal with him, and to bring his fault to publike hearing that he may be punished.* Objections against excommunication removed.

Answ. 1. The same phrase in the same doctrine of scandals is, *Luke* 17. 3. Take heed to your selves, ἐὰν δὲ ἁμαρτῇ εἰς σε ὁ ἀδελφός σου: *If thy brother trespasse against thee, rebuke him, and if he repent forgive him.* But it cannot be said that if our brother transgress against God, we knowing of that, we are not to forgive him a sin committed against God, though he should come to us, and say that he repenteth, for then might any private brother pardon murthers and sorceries, and if this private brother were a Magistrate, by this he is to forgive bloods, and not use the sword against the evill doer, and is to dispence with it *seventy seven times, if the offender say, he repenteth.* 2. The text saith expresly, *If thy brother trespasse* εἰς σὲ *against thee*, not εἰς θεὸν against God. It is true, sinnes against a brother, are sins against God, but it is evident from the text, that *Christ* speakes of such sinnes in a speciall manner, committed against me, or a particular brother, which are within the verge of my power or his to pardon, as not being yet publikely scandalous.

3. *Camero*

Prælec. in Math. 18. ver. 15. page 144.

3. *Camero* saith, to sinne against any here, is not to sinne against God with the knowledge of a brother, but it is to sinne in private against a brother, so as the offended brother is in meeknes to labour to gaine him, and not bring his fault to publike, if he can be cured in private, and therefore with much lenity we are to proceed, whereas before Christ had exhorted not to contemne our brother, here he teacheth with what loving patience and longanimity we are to labour to gaine him when he is fallen, else Christ should say but the same thing over againe, that he said once.

Object. 2. *But by this place of Scripture,* I *should rebuke any brother whom I know to sinne against God, to the end* I *may gaine him to repentance, and that before two Witnesses? Now this is absurd: my Father, my King and Prince before two Witnesses; And therfore by the Church is meant a number of private Christians before whom I am to convince my brother, and that I am not to rebuke any offender whatsoever, is cleare in that* Solomon *saith, it is a mans glory to passe by an offence, and we are not to over-heare our servant cursing us,* Ergo, *We are not to rebuke every one, nor to bring them before any Church Court.*

We may rebuke our brother in a prudent way.

Answ. 1. This argument is against Christ, as well as against us, for it tendeth to conclude that it is not universally true, that I am to rebuke every offending brother, which I will grant in some sense. For 1. If the fault be small, and possibly a matter of goods, with which I may dispence, without lesse hurt to my brothers soule, then the evill of scandall may be, if I complaine to either the *Church* or *Magistrate*, *I am rather to suffer Wrong*, 1 Cor. 6. 7. But becaus I am not to rebuke my brother imprudently, may I not conclude from Christs words, I may rebuke him? Or becaus a meane person may not rebuke a Ruler, or a Prince, or King? Will it follow that a *Nathan* may not rebuke King *David*, and becaus *Ionathan* may not rebuke King *Saul* his Father, shall it follow that no other may rebuke King *Saul*? Or becaus I may not rebuke a scorner, though a professing brother, or becaus I may not rebuke my brother before two or three witnesses, who to my knowledge bear the offender ill will, and so I see my rebuking shall be so far from gaining him to repentance, that it shall provoke him to a greater offence, shall it therfore follow I am to suffer sin in my brother and not to rebuke him at all, which the Spirit

rit of God calleth a hating of my brother in my heart, *Lev.* 19. *v.* 18. This argument concludeth not that I may not rebuke my brother, but onely that I may not rebuke my brother imprudently, or that any brother may not rebuke any brother, whoever he be, King or Ruler, *Negatio modi non negat rem ipsam*, so we are to passe by offences and to be willing to forgive them. *Ergo*, we are not to rebuke an offending brother, it doth not follow, I must be willing to forgive all, friend, or enemy, *Ergo*, by this reason I am not to rebuke any at all, and *Solomon* willeth us onely not to be swift, too glad and willing, or too quicke and sharpe eared to heare every ill word, *Eccles.* 7. 21. Also *Heb. Give not thy heart to all words that are spoken, least thou hear thy servant curse thee.* So is the same phrase, *Eccles.* 1. 13. *Prov.* 23. 26. *Eccles.* 1. 17. Not unlike this is the phrase *Dan.* 6. 14. *The King set his heart to deliver* Daniel, But this will not prove we are not to rebuke an offending brother. 2. That by the Church here, is meant a number of private Christians, is against the Text, for then three witnesses should be a Church, being three private Christians, but sure it is Christ ascendeth in his speech to an higher degree, to the Church who is to heare the Witnesses, the Plaintiffe and the Offender, who hath power to binde, and loose, which is nothing but a Church-court. 2. *Thou hast gained thy brother*, must be a spirituall gaining of him to repentance, as 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. *That they may be gained by the conversation of the Wives*, 1 *Cor.* 9, 20. ἵνα κερδήσω *That* I *may gain those that are under the Law.* Ver. 21. *That I may gain those that are without Law.* ver. 19. *That I might gaine the more.* Ver. 20. ἵνα Ἰουδαίους κερδήσω *That* I *might gain the* Iewes, so is the Word used for spirituall gaining, *Mat.* 2. 17, 20, 22. and Christ in his Sermons never speaketh of civill gaining of brethren: And 2. Because he speaketh of the brother, as he is a member of a society, where there be three or more brethren, and a Church of brethren whose helpe he may seeke to gaine a brother; it is cleare he must speake of a Church-gaining, or of a gaining in order to a Church, and not with reference to any civill *Sanedrim* or Court of *Magistrates.*

אל-
תתן
לבך
שם לב

Object. 3. *The place* (*saith* Erastus) *is to to be understood of lighter faults, for which one brother may pardon another, and which a private brother hath power to conceale, it cannot therefore in good sense* Erastus.

be extended to weighty scandals that are to be punished with Excommunication.

Ans. 1. A fault may be light and small in its rise, so long as it is private, which deserveth not excommunication, but if contumacie shall come to the fault, as it is here in its growth and tendencie to scandalize many, it is not small. 2. A private fault is not hence concluded to be small; becauſe a brother may pardon it, and conconceale it. For *Christ* saith to scandalize on of the *least of these that beleeveth in him*, is so great an offence, that it were good for the man so offending, *to be cast in the Sea*, having a *millstone hanged about his necke*, ver. 6. And yet a brother is to forgive such an offence, *Luke* 17. 2, 3, 4. 3. In that a brother is obliged to gaine his brother, from this fault, it is cleare; it is not so small a fault, and 2. Becauſe it is a fault to be brought to the Church; and 3. If the Offender remaine obstinate, he is therefore to be esteemed *as an Heathen and a Publican*, or as no brother, nor any member of the Church; and 4. This sinne is *bound in earth and heaven*. 5. The text will not bear that all weigh y faults, such as Murther, that *defileth the Land*, or solicitation to *follow strange Gods* may be transacted betweene brother and brother and concealed. *Deut.* 13. 8. Though *Ioseph* be in this called a just man, (as *Beza* observeth) in that he would not make *Mary* his wife a publike example, nor reveale her Adultery, which was by the Law to be punished by death, for so *Ioseph* conceived of her.

Mat. 18.

Tell the Church, that is, (saith *Erastus*) *tell the civill Syncdry of the Iewes, and therefore this place is nothing for excommunication, or any Spirituall Church Discipline, and if the Offendor refuse to heare the Orthodoxe Magistrate, then may the offended brother plead his right before the Heathen Magistrate, and deale with the Offendor, as with a Heathen, and a Publican.*

Object. 4.

Answ. In the Word of God, the word *Ecclesia*, *Church*, applyed to matters of Religion, (as it is evidently here, where it is said that the offended brother, is to labour to gaine the soule of his offending brother) doth never signifie a civill judicature, and therefore the exposition is insolent, and the words עדה or קהל or ἐκκλησία or συναγωγη can never beare such a sense, we desire one paralell place in the old or new Testament for it.

The church Mat. 18. is not the Civill Sanedrim.

2. The scope of the place is the removall of scandals in Christs meeke,

meek, brotherly and Christian way, *ver.6.* ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ &c. *Who ever shall scandalize*, &c. and ver.7. *Wo to the world because of offences*----ver.8. *Wherefore if thy hand or foot* σκανδαλίζῃ σε, *cause thee to offend, cut them off*, ver.10. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones*, &c. And then he cometh from active scandals, whereby we offend others, and the way of removall of them, to passive scandals, whereby others offendeth us, and the way of removall of them, ver.15. *Moreover if thy brother shall trespasse against thee, go tell him the fault betvveen thee and him.* Now these sins that are to be punished by the sword of the Civill Magistrate, or not such sins as may be transacted between brother and brother, for homicide, blasphemy, sorcery, extortion are to be taken away by the publick sword, and this must have place, *Thou shalt not conceal it, thy eye shall not spare him, and the Magistrate is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath on him that doth evil*, Rom.13.4.

3. Christ hinteth not, in any sort, at any word of blood, wrath, vengeance, the sword, evil doing, fear and terrour for the sword, such as are αἷμα, ὀργὴ, ἐκδίκη, μαχαίρα, κακοποίησαι, φόβος, as the office of the civil magistrate is holden forth to us in other places, as *Rom.* 13. 1 *Pet.*2. No man, except he intended violence to the text, can dream of such a latent, forrain and co-acted sense in the words, and if such a sense had been intended by our Saviour, he behoved in this place to erect a throne from a divine institution, for the Magistrate, which no impartiall interpreter, can with any half side of a shadow perceive in the words.

4. The end of this processe is spirituall: *If he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother to repentance*, as is confirmed already from Scripture. But whether the offender be gained to repentance or not, the Magistrate is to use the sword, that others may fear; as a Magistrate, he is to regard the peace of the Common-wealth, not the salvation of the offender directly.

5. Christs way of proceeding to take away scandals between brother and brother, is spirituall, *Tell him, admonish the offender, tell the Church*, that they may rebuke and admonish, and this is a Morall way all along: But the Magistrates proceeding is not Morall, by requests, orations, admonitions, but by the reall use of the sword to compell: *for he beareth not the sword in vain*, Rom.13.4.

6. The proceeding here is with much lenity, patience, and long

suffering to gain an offender, but having recourse to the Magistrate to use his club and sword, is rather a way of irritation, to make the gap the wider, and therefore *Paul*, 1 *Cor.*6. condemnes this as repugnant to love, that they should *go to law one with another, before the heathen Magistrate.*

7. Such an expression as this, (*Let him to thee as an heathen man and a Publican*) is never taken for the civill complaining of him before an Heathen judge, nor doth it expresse the use of the sword by the Magistrate; its so insolent a phrase, that all the Greek Authors that ever wrote, cannot parallel it; for this is a Spirituall and Morall reproach put on the offender, the Magistrates way is a reall inflicting of punishment.

8. This remedy is contrary to *Pauls*, 1 *Cor.*6. For there the offended brother, though the offending party be never so contumacious, hath not this remedy of Christs to implead his brother before an heathen Magistrate, that the Apostle taketh for a sinfull scandall, and sin cannot be Christs remedy: *Pauls* remedy is, *Suffer rather wrong and defraudation*; *Paul* by this interpretation should have commanded them the contrary.

9. Where is ever the supreame Magistrate (who cannot be excluded, if this exposition stand) called by the name of the Church.

10. How incongruous is it, that Christ should direct the Iews, who were to be dispersed through all the earth; to go up to *Jerusalem* for judgement, seeing *Ierusalem* was to be laid equall with the ground; and the Iews, their state, Church, policy, and the Scepter *now removed from Iudah*, let wise men judge.

11. The complaining to an Heathen Magistrate, or the punishing of an offender by the sword, by no Scripture, is such a *binding on earth*, by the power of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, as this is expounded, *Matth.*16.19. And such a binding as is ratified in Heaven, and that by the joynt Prayers of two or three on earth, as is here spoken, ver.18,19,20. A Heathen Magistrates Sentence, though never so just, should not be valued, except it were confirmed by the Prayers of the Church, as the Sentence of Excommunication must be.

12. The Iewish *Sanedrim* was now to take an end, and expire with all the Iewish policy; it is not to be imagined that *Iesus Christ* would

would appoint a perishing remedy for a perpetuall and ever-enduring disease; now offences and scandals between brother and brother were to be in the world to the end, ver. 15. *If thy brother offend*, &c. And *Christ* saith, *Offences must be*, and the remedy here is morall and perpetuall: as 1. That Christ shall have a Church visible on earth, against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail: 2. That we first deal to gain our brother in private, ere to his greater shame, he be brought in publick, before the Church. 3. The Lords ratifying in Heaven, what his servants *shall binde and loose on earth.* 4. *The agreeing of two to pray together, the conveening of two or three in the name of Christ*, with a promise of the presence of Christ, all these are Morall and perpetuall: The Lord never did the like of this, before or after.

13. In all the New-Testament we do not read, that Christ, who was the end of the Law, and the body now come in the flesh to abolish all Ceremonials and temporary Laws of the Iewish Church and policy, as Iewish, did institute any old-Testament Law, such as the *Sanedrim* was for offending brethren: if it be said that this was but the right expounding of an old divine Law, now almost buried through the corruption of men; then must *Erastus* shew that this was an old Law of divine institution, that the Iews were to keep this threefold order in gaining an offending brother, and that this is now abolished, and that the power of the Magistrate in Church-businesse, by this place is not established to the end of the world; both which are contrary to the Principles of *Erastus*, not to say that there is not in this whole Chapter, or *Luk.* 17. where the same purpose is handled, any shadow of reason to assert that Christ is restoring any Ceremoniall or Iudiciall Law to its genuine and sound meaning and sense, but by the contrary Christ speaketh of the Morall and perpetuall Doctrine of scandall, and how we are to deal with an offending brother to gain him to repentance, either by our selves or the Church, and to forgive private injuries, even to seventy seven times: Lastly, since Publicans and Romans converted to the Christian faith from Paganisme, even at this time were Brethren, who might both give and take scandals, it shall follow that Christ commandeth Gentiles to submit to the Iewish Magistrates, this was against Christian liberty, *and to take from Cesar those things that are Cesars*, which is unjust.

But

How Publicans were excluded from the Temple.

But, saith Erastus, *Publicans were not in* Iuda *excluded from sacrifices*, Luk. 18. *A Pharisee and a Publican went up to the Temple to pray, Christ himself did eat with Publicans and sinners: therefore this phrase (Let him be unto thee as an Heathen and a Publican) cannot expresse this (Let him be excommunicated) except you say, that all heathen and Publicans were so served by Christ, and the Iews, as if they had been excommunicated.*

(a) Deut. 23.1,2,3,4,5. Psa.79.1. Lam.1.10.

Ans. 1. Publicans, that were by Nation Heathens, were excluded from sacrifices and the Temple, *jure*, by (*a*) Gods Law; but not *de facto*, because the Iews being under bondage to the *Romane* Emperour, and spoiled of their Liberties and Laws, might not put their Laws in execution against Heathen and Publicans; it is sufficient to us, saith *Beza*, that Publicans were execrable and hatefull to the Iews, and (say I) that Heathen and Publicans remaining such, are without the Church, (*b*) and not to be reputed as brethren, but enemies to the true Church of God, and this is that which to us is Excommunication.

(b) Lev.25 44. Lev. 26.45 2Kin.16.3. 2Kin.17.8. 11. 1 Chro.16. 35. 2 Chro.33. 2,9. Neh.5.8,9 Psa.9.19. Psal.10.16. Psal.33.10. Psal.44.2. Psa.80.9. Ier.10.2. Ezech. 23. 30. Eze.25.7. Ioel 2.7. Obad.v.15 Mic.5.15. Hag.2.22. Zach.1.15.

I do not doubt but Publicans went to the Temple to pray, but that is but to Argue, *A facto ad jus*, not the right way, *A jure ad factum*: Publicans ought not to have done so. 2. *Christ* the Supream Lawgiver, who is above the Law, did often dispense with sacrifice and positive Laws, for a work of mercy, and if he touched the dead, and touched the skin of the Leaper, and suffered his disciples to pluck the ears of Corne on the Sabbath day, what marvell then he did eat with Publicans and sinners, contrary to the Letter of a positive Law, *Knowing his own, whom the Father had given to him* from eternity were to be brought in to himself, by his familiar conversing with them; why should not the Physitian converse with the sick; the shepheard with the lost sheep; the Redeemer with his ransomed ones? But this is no warrant, that therefore the cleansed Leaper should not *shew himself to the Priest*, or that an obstinate offender should not be reputed as a Heathen, and not admitted into the Sanctuary. 3. That simple Publicans, or Heathen remaining such, should sacrifice. I never read, sacrifices were offered for *Iobs friends*, who were not within the *visible Church*: But 1. by Gods own speciall and immediate command: as we read, Iob 42.7,8. A positive Law for it (which yet was requisite for ordinary worship of that kinde) we read not. 2. I think *Iobs* friends can-

cannot in knowledge, Religion, Profession, be esteemed meer Heathens, and therefore as God tied not himself to a positive and standing Law here, so neither was Christ, being the same God equall with the Father, so restrained from not familiar conversing with Heathen, and Publicans, but he might leap over a Ceremony to save a lost soul.

Object. 6. *But (the adversaries say) Christ here useth words proper to the Iewish Synedry and the Old-Testament, as Witnesses, Ecclesia, or congregation, Heathen, Publican, and these are not New Testament words, nor was there such a thing as a New Testament Church on earth at this time, and Christ having not yet ascended to Heaven, nor sent down the holy Spirit, cannot be thought to hold forth the power and jurisdiction of a thing yet destitute of all being, such as was the Christian Church, nor can he here speak of Christs Spirituall Kingdom.*

Ans. 1. Christ did well to use these words, *Witnesses, Church, Congregation, Heathen, Publican*, as well known to his hearers, and these same words in use amongst the Iews are used in the New-Testament, as 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. *Act.* 15. 7, 17. *Revel.* 11. 2, 8. 1 *Pet.* 4. 3. 2 *Pet.* 1 19. 20, 21. *Anathema Maranatha, Witnesses, Gentiles, sinners of the Gentiles, imposition of hands, &c.* Indeed in ordinary, the Pastor under the New Testament is not called Priest, nor high Priest, nor the Communion Table an Altar: But the words here used are obvious and very significant; and the word ἐκκλησία or Church is a most obvious word in both the Old and New Testament, and doth signifie any Assembly, Religious, civill or prophane, according as the nature, person and use or end of the meeting or Assembly was Religious and Prophane, as is evident by many places of the Old and New Testament; where the seventy Interpreters use the word for a Church-Assembly; for which see *the due right of Presbyters*, page 349, 350. and *page* 473, 474. And since the word *Church* here is cleerely, a company convened to gaine an offending brothers soule, by rebukes and censure, and which hath power to binde and loose on earth, so as their fact is ratified in heaven, it cannot be any other, then a New Testament *Church-meeting*, seeing we find the *Church* of *Corinth* commanded to conveene and exercise such a power, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.

And

And therfore it cannot be expounded of the civill judge; not to adde, that *Eraſtus*, who objecteth this, ſaith the *Synedre had both civill and ſpirituall or Eccleſiaſticall power*, and therefore he hath no ground to expound the place of the *Civill Magiſtrate*. 2. Becauſe *he was not yet aſcended to heaven, and had not ſent downe the Holy Spirit*, it is no conſequence to ſay he ſpeaketh nothing of the Chriſtian Church of the *Nevv Teſtament*, for before his Aſcenſion he appointed the Miniſtery, the Sacraments, the power of Cenſures, and the keyes given to the Church of the New Teſtament, *Math.* 28. 19, 20. *Joh.* 20. *v.* 21, 22. *Math.* 26. 20, 21, 22, 23, &c. Now it is as inconvenient, that precepts, ſuch as (*Do this in remembrance of me,*) (*take yee, eate yee,*) and (*he that heareth you, heareth me,*) ſhould be given to the chriſtian Church, which yet had no being, as for Chriſt to hold forth the power of juriſdiction of a Chriſtian church deſtitute of all being. Yea, this recurreth upon *Eraſtus*, who will have *Chriſt* here to hold forth the power of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, as yet remoter from being, all Magiſtrates being profeſſed Enemies to *Ieſus Chriſt*, whereas there was at this time a ſeed, a bottome of a chriſtian viſible Church: There being eleven Apoſtles, ſeventy Diſciples, and many others who profeſſed faith in Chriſt already come. Yea though there be no formed inſtituted viſible Church of the New Teſtament, yet it became our great Prophet, who taught that Goſpell, yea, *all that he heard of the Father*, Ioh. 15. 15. to his Diſciples, which was to be a rule of the Faith of the Chriſtian viſible Church not yet inſtituted, and who erected a Miniſtery to teach them before his aſcenſion, alſo to furniſh that Miniſtery with the power of the keyes & cenſures, as he expreſly doth before his death, *Mat.* 16. 17, 18, 19. Not to adde what *Camero* ſaith, that he ſpake theſe words when he was now to offer himſelfe on the Croſſe, and *Math.* 2. 16. He mentioneth the edifying of the Church of the New Teſtament, and the *Diſciples aske vvho is to be greateſt in the Kingdome of God*, ver. 1.

Object. 7. *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen and Publican, can not meane as much as, Let him bee excommunicated, but onely, let him plead vvith his obſtinate brother vvho contemneth the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, before the heathen Magiſtrate, and in preſerving the offendor, vvho is novv obſtinate, let him deale vvith him*

as

as with a Heathen and a Publican, onely in this matter of pursuit, but otherwise the Publican was not excommunicate. 1. *Because the Publicans place and office was good and lawfull and from God, then to repute him as a Publican is not to repute him as a prophane man.* 2. *When* Iohn Baptist *is demanded by the Publicans what they shall doe, he doth not bid them lay downe the office of a Publican, but onely not abuse it to rapine and extortion, nor is* Zacheus *compelled by Christ to lay downe his office, but onely to make restitution.*

Answ. 1. There is no necessity to condemne the office of the *Publican*, or the birth and condition of the *Heathen* as unlawfull. But a *Publican* went for a prophane man, and for a man who is a stranger to the true church of God, as *Mat.* 5.46. *If you love them that love you, what reward have you? Doe not even the Publicans the same? Ergo*, It is Christs mind to exclude the Publicans from any spirituall or eternall reward, promised to these within the visible Church; and when *Christ* was slandered by the *Jewes*, because he went in to be *a Guest with a Publican*, Luke 19. 7. And because hee *did eate with Publicans*, *Mat.* 9. 12, 13. *Christ* taketh it as granted that *Publicans* were prophane men and sinners. But he saith they were sicke sinners and lost, that is, such as were sensible of their by-past prophanity, and desired the Physitian *Christ* to cure them; and *Gentiles* or Heathen is taken for these who are without the Church, and are void of Religion, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. Such fornication as is not so much as *named amongst the Gentiles*, 1 *Pet.* 4.3. *Let it suffice you, that ye have wrought the will of the Gentiles*, Eph. 2. 11. *Ye were in times past Gentiles*, what is that, but Ver. 2. *Ye walked according to the course of the World; according to the Prince of the power of the aire?* So a *Samaritan*, is taken for one that hath a Devill, yet to be a *Samaritan* by birth and nation is not unlawfull, it is then a distinctive terme spoken διαχρίσως to be an Heathen, or counted an Heathen and a Publican, that is, counted a prophane wicked person, not a brother, not a member of the church. *Theophylact* expoundeth this with us, *If he heare not the Church, let him be an out-cast, least he rub any of his wickednes upon others within the Church.*

Theophylact in Math. 18 ἐὰν ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀκούσῃ, τοῦτο ἔστω ἀποβλήτος, ἵνα μὴ τῆς ἰδίας κακίας μεταδῷ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις.

And these words *Let him be to thee*, is a word of command, as *Mat.* 5. 37. ἔστω δὲ *Let your speech be yea, yea*, Mat. 20. *he that would be greatest, let him be your servant*; and, let him be to thee,

is not to exclude the Church, but it is set downe in a Law-manner in the second person, for farre more must the obstinate offender *be as an Heathen and a Publican* to the *Church.*

Ver. 18. *Verily I say unto you, What yee bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and what yee loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.* These words contain a reason why he who contemneth the Church, is to be holden as a *Heathen and a Publican.* Why? is it such an offence before God to despise the church? Yea, saith our Saviour, with a grave asseveration, *Verily I say unto you, they that despise the sentence* of you the Ministers of the Gospel, being according to truth given out, they and their sinnes shall be bound in Heaven.

Object. 8. Erastus *saith, he is said to bind, who doth retaine the sinne, when he maketh the obstinate brother unexcusable; and he looseth, who remitteth or pardoneth the injury, and gaineth to repentance his brother by a brotherly admonition, for except he speake of a brotherly composing of private injuries, to what end should Christ subjoyne* πάλιν λέγω ὑμῖν *Again I say to you if two agree,* &c.

Answ. 1. Christ doth argue from the lesse to the more, he proveth what the *Church bindeth on earth, shall be bound in Heaven,* because if the prayers of two or three gathered together in the name of God, and agreeing together on earth, are not rejected in Heaven, farre more shall that be ratified in heaven, which the whole church of *Christ* decreeth on earth in the name of the head of the Church, Iesus Christ. 2. When in the chapter going before, Christ had ascribed to the *Apostles* and *Pastors*, which are the eyes of the Church, a power of the keyes, and here he ascribeth to them the power of binding and loosing, there was no cause to dreame that he speaketh here of a private forgiving of private sinnes betweene Brother and brother, for then he might have said at the first step, *Thou hast gained thy brother*, that gaining or convincing of thy brother shall be bound or loosed in heaven, no lesse then the Churches judiciall binding and loosing in heaven, which yet is set downe as an higher degree of power. But I may here say with *Beza* in the whole Scripture, the word of *binding and loosing is never spoken of any other but of these who are in publike places*, and by a borrowed speech, here it is spoken in regard of Spirituall power. To *bind and to loose*, is by a judiciall power in subordi-

Beza de de Presbyterio & excem. p. 60.

subordination to *Christ* the King, *to remit and retaine sinnes.* So *Iosephus* saith, the *Pharisees ruled all, so that they would banish or recall from banishment, loose and bind whom they pleased,* and upon the Authority according to the which Christ sent *his Disciples as the Father sent him,* so he instructed his Ministers with power to *remit and retaine sinnes,* Ioh. 20. 23. and Mat. 16. 19. *What thou bindest* ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς, *on earth, shall be bound in heaven, what thou looseſt on earth, shall be loosed in heaven,* ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς. So doth *Lucian* bring in that prisoner speaking to *Iupiter, Loose me, O* Iupiter, *for I have suffered grievous things,* Mat. 22. 13. *Then the King said to his servants, take him,* δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, *binde him hand and foot*; binding here (you see) is done by the command of the *great King, Acts* 21. 11. *So shall the Iewes* δήσουσι *binde Paul,* they bound *Paul with Law and authority,* such as it was, *Iohn* 18. 12. *The Captaine and Officers tooke Iesus,* καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸν *and bound him,* they bound him not by private authority, *Mat.* 27. 2. and *Act.* 24. 27. *Felix* left *Paul* δεδεμένον *bound*; if Lictors binde any Malefactors, they doe it by authoritie and Law. So do the Hebrews speake, *Psal.* 105. 20. *The Ruler of the people looſed him,* Psal. 102. 20. *The Lord looketh downe from heaven,* לְפַתֵּחַ *to open or loose the children of death.* Psal, 146. 7. *The Lord looseth the Prisoners,* Iob 12. 18.

Ioseph de bello Iudaico l. 1. c. 4. *Pharisæi omnia pro arbitrio administrabant,* δήσειν τε καὶ κατάγειν ὃς ἐθέλοιεν, λύειν τε καὶ δεῖν. *Lucian. dialo.* 1. λύσον μὲ ὦζεῦ, δεῖνα καὶ πόδε πεπόνθα.

So doth the word אסר Num. 11. 28. signifie.

3. It cannot be denyed, but when one private brother pardons another repenting Brother, God ratifieth that in heaven. But it is cleare the pardon here holden forth by our Saviour, is such a loosing, as hath witnesses going before. 2. Such an one as cometh higher to the knowledge of the Chuuch. Nor doth the particle πάλιν *again*, signifie any thing but *preterea, moreover.*

Binding and loosing acts judiciall.

4. And who can say that *binding and loosing* here, is some other thing then *binding and loosing* in the Chap. 16. ver. 9. Where the same very phrase in the Greeke is one and the same, except that the Lord speaketh, *Mat.* 16. 19. in the singular number to *Peter,* as representing the teachers and Governours of the Church, and here *Mat.* 18. He speaketh in the Plurall number, relating to the Church. Now *Mat.* 16. 18, 19. *binding on earth, and loosing,* which is ratified in heaven, is evidently the exercise of the power of the keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven, *I will give to thee the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven.* What be these keyes, he expoundeth

poundeth in the same very verse, *and whatsoever thou shalt binde on earth, shall be bound in heaven, whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*; then *binding and loosing on earth*, must be in these to whom Christ hath committed the power of the keyes: but 1. Christ hath not committed the keyes to all, but to *Church-rulers*, that are the *Stewards* of the House, and the dispensers of heavenly Mysteries. Hence the *keyes* in Scripture signifie authority and officiall dignity that is in Rulers, not in private men, as *Esa.* 22. 22. *And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder.* So *Christ* is said to have the *key of David, to open and no man shutteth, to shut and no man openeth.* By which out of doubt (saith *(a) Camero,*) *is pointed forth the kingly authority and power of Christ*, so saith (*b*) *Vatablus*. And our owne (*c*) *Calvin*, (*d*) *Musculus*, (*e*) *Gualther*, (*f*) *Piscator*, (*g*) *Beza*, (*h*) *Pareus* agree, that the keyes are *insigne potestatis*, an *Ensigne of power given to the Steward or Master of a Noblemans house, who is a person in office*; The giving of the keyes (saith worthy Mr. *Cotton*,) is a giving *power for the preaching of the Word, the administring of the seales and censures, by which these invested with power doe open and shut the gates.* Now we desire any Word of God, by which it can be made good, that the keyes and power to binde and loose is given to all that are in the house, even private Christians. But we can shew the *Keyes*, and *binding and loosing*, and opening and shutting to be given to the Officers and Rulers of the house. Hence I argue that interpretation that confoundeth the key-bearers, and the Children, with the Servants of the House; and the Governours that are over the people in the Lord, with the governed, and putteth the Characters proper to the Officers and Stewards, confusedly upon all that are in the house, is not to be holden; but this interpretation is such; *Ergo*, &c. also to *binde and to loose is* expounded by *Christ*, *Ioh.*20.21. to be a power *to retain and remit sins on earth*, which are accordingly *retained and remitted in Heaven*, and that by vertue of a calling, and Ministeriall mission, according to which the *Father* sent *Christ Jesus*; and *Iesus Christ* sendeth his *Apostles* and *Pastors* to the end of the world, as is clear, if we compare *Matth.*18.18. and *Matth.*16.19. with *Ioh.*20.20,21,22.23. *Mar.* 16. ver.15,20. *Matth.*28.18,19,20. *Luk.*24.45,46,47,48.

(*a*) *Camero prelect. in Mat.*16.
(*b*) *Vatablus* on *Esay* 22.
(*c*) *Calvin prelect. in Esay* 22.
(*d*) *Muscu. com, ibid.*
(*e*) *Gualther Homil. in loc.*
(*f*) *Piscator shol. in Esa.*
(*g*) *Beza* on Mat.16.
(*h*) *Pareus comment. in* Mat. 16.
(*i*) *Cotton* Keyes of the Kingdome p. 2.

5. It

5. It is against the course of the Text, that we should restrain this to private pardoning of light injuries between brother and brother: 1. Because Christ labours to decline this, that one shall be both his brothers judge to put him in the condition of *an Heathen* and *Publican*, and binde his brothers sins in Heaven and Earth, and also, that he should be his party and accuser: Now Christ will have the private brother do no more personally, but admonish his brother and gain him. 2. If that prevail not, then he is to admonish him before two or three witnesses: See here, the brother is not both party and judge; but witnesses have place. 3. If that prevail not, the businesse is to ascend higher, even to the *Church*, which undoubtedly is an Organicall body, 1 *Cor.* 12.28. *Rom.* 8.6,7, &c. *Act.* 20.28,29,30. Whereas two or three private Christians are not a Church, but an homogeneal body: Now who would believe that Christ is to bring down the businesse which is so high, as before the Church, to the lowest step again, to a private binding and loosing to one brother, who both as judge and party judgeth his brother; yea, and may do this, though there were no Church on earth? What power hath the Church above the offended brother, or the offender, if the one may binde the other under guiltinesse in earth and heaven? 2. *Erastus* will have light and private offences only spoken of here: Now Christ speaketh of offences that God taketh notice of in Heaven and earth. 3. Christs way is a wise and meek way, that that which one cannot do, and the offence that two, three, four cannot remove, the *Church* shall remove, but *Erastus* maketh one private man to remove it, and to Excommunicate and binde in heaven and earth. I might cite, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Augustine*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, *Hyeronimus*, and all modern interpreters both Popish and Orthodox for this interpretation, not any of them dreaming of the insolent opinion of *Erastus*, who misapplieth *Augustine* and *Theophylact* for his own way, as *Beza* cleareth. *Beza* de *Presbyter*, pag. 63,64.

CAP.

CAP. IV. Queſt. 1.

That the place, 1 Corinthians 5. *doth evince that Excommunication is an Ordinance of God.*

That Excommunication is a divine Ordinance is proved by 1 *Cor.* 5.

THE Argument for Excommunication may be thus framed, from 1 *Cor.* 5. If *Paul* command that the inceſtuous *man ſhould be delivered to Satan* ver. 5. *purged out of the Church, leaſt as leaven he ſhould corrupt the Church,* ver. 6, 7. *That they ſhould judge him,* ver. 12. *And put him away from amongſt them,* ver. 13. *So as they were not to eat with him,* ver. 9. 10. Then is there a divine command for Excommunication; for the Commandments of the Apoſtles *are the Commandments of the Lord,* 1 *Cor.* 14. 37. 2 *Pet.* 3. 2. But the former is true: *Ergo,* ſo is the latter.

There is no ground or ſhadow of reaſon to expound this expelling of the inceſtuous man by the preaching of the word without any Church-cenſures, for all that is required in Excommunication is here; 1. This putting out was not done by one ſingle Paſtor, as putting out by the preaching of the word is done, but by a company and Church, ver. 4. *In the name of the Lord Ieſus, when ye are gathered together, and my Spirit.* 2. *Paul* ſhould have written to any one Paſtor to caſt him out by preaching; but here he writeth to a *Church*: 3. He forbiddeth company, or eating with ſuch like men, *v.* 10. Now this is more then rebuking by preaching. 4. This is a judging of the inceſtuous man, and a caſting of him out of their ſociety, which is another thing then preaching the word.

To deliver to *Satan* is not miraculous killing.

Eraſtus and others expound the giving to *Satan,* of a delivering of the man to *Satan,* to be miraculouſly killed, as were *Ananias* and *Saphira, Act.* 5. 5. And becauſe at this time there was no Chriſtian Magiſtrate to uſe the ſword againſt the man, therefore he writeth to the *Church,* that they by their prayers would obtain of God, that *Satan* might take him out of the midſt of them.

Anſ. This inſolent interpretation wanteth all warrant of the word: For 1. To deliver to *Satan,* hath no Scripture to make this ſenſe of it, to pray that *Satan* would deſtroy the man. 2. It wanteth

teth an example in the old or new Testament, that the whole *Church* are fellow-Agents and joynt causes in the bodily destruction of any, or in working of miracles, such as was the killing of *Ananias* and *Saphira*: The Apostles wrought miracles, and that by their Faith and Prayers, and *Christ* and the Prophets; but that the Believers, who should have mourned for this scandall, 1. Who were puffed up: 2. Who were in danger to be leavened with the mans sin, and had their consent in Excommunication, should joyn in a miraculous delivering to *Satan*, is an unparalleld practise in the word. 3. To *deliver to Satan*, cannot be expounded here: but as 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. Where *Paul* saith he had delivered *Hymenæus* and *Alexander* to *Satan*, now that was not to kill them, but ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, that they *might receive instruction and be disciplined*, by this medicinall Church-revenge, not to *blaspheme*: I know of no instructing of these who are dead; if there be two deliverings to *Satan*, let *Erastus* and his expound it to us. 4. The Apostle expresly saith, he wrote to them, not to *keep company* with such men, nor with *Fornicators, covetous men, Drunkards, Extortioners, Idolators*: Now *Erastus* his minde must be, that the *Apostles* and *Churches* of *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Thessalonica*, grievously sinned against God, in that they did not miraculously kill all the Drunkards, the covetous persons, the fornicators, whereas they are commanded to admonish them as brethren, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14, 15. and to pray for them, if they sin not against the holy Ghost, 1 *Ioh.* 5. 16. 1 *Tim.* 2 3. 5. *Paul* rebuketh this as a morall fault amongst the *Corinthians*, such as is not to mourn for this mans fault, and to keep him as leaven in the midst of them, and not to cast him out: Whereas in all the Scripture you finde none ever rebuked, because they put not forth in Acts an extraordinary and miraculous power to work miracles; working of miracles came upon persons called thereunto, by extraordinary rapts, and were in men not as habits under the power of free-will, but as immediate Acts of God, even as fire-flaughts are in the Aire: So I conceive, while I be better informed. 6. And shall it not follow, that now when the Churches have Christian Magistrates, it is the will of our meek saviour, that they kill with the sword all the Drunkards, Fornicators, and all that walketh unorderly; which should make the Church of Christ a Butcher-house, whereas we are to *admonish all such as brethren*, 2 *Thess.* 3. 15. And to wait on them with

all

all patience, if God peradventure may give them repentance. 7. The destruction of the flesh must be the destruction of the body. But the bodies of the godly are saved no lesse then their spirits in the day of the Lord. 8. And for many of the former reasons, by delivering to Satan, cannot be meant a miraculous tormenting of the body by Sathan, with the saving of the life; Such as we read was the case of *Iob*; for the delivering to Sathan, is to cast out of the Church, and declare such an offendor to be of the number of the wicked world, of which Sathan is Prince, *Ioh.* 12. 31. *Ioh.* 14. 30. and God, 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. and that which we assert as the essentials of excommunication, are, 1. Here is a member of the Church, one *who is Within*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. one who hath fallen in a foul scandall, and had his fathers wife, ver. 1. who by the *Church* conveened *in the name of our Lord Iesus*, with that spirit of the Apostle given to them by Christ, *v.* 4. *was delivered to Sathan, that his soule may be saved*, (for that is the genuine and intrinsecall end of Excommunication,) and to be *purged out of the Church*, lest he should infect the Sheepe, ver. 7. and Christians were not to bear company with him, nor *to eate with him*, ver. 9. 10. and he was judged to be cast out as a *Heathen and Publican*, ver. 12. 13. and that by a convened court, having the name and authority of him who is King of the Church, *ver.* 4. and more wee doe not crave. Obj. *To deliver any to the power of Sathan, is no mean of salvation.* Answ. A morall delivering to the efficacy of error, and a reprobate minde, is not a mean of salvation, nor is excommunication such a mean, nor in the power of the Church, but a medicinall depriving of an offender of the comfortable communion of the Saints, and of the prayers of the Church, and meanes of grace, such is a means, and mighty through God to humble.

The essentials of excommunication, 1 Cor. 5.

CAP. V. Quest. 1.

Whether the Word doth warrant discipline and censures, even to the excluding of the scandalous from the Sacraments, beside the Pastorall rebukes inflicted by one.

WE are not to conceive that there was nothing Morall in the Lawes that God made to his people of *Israel*, to debarre

debar the unclean, from the society of Gods people, and from communion with them in the holy things of God, *Numb.*5. 1. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying:* 2. *Command the children of Israel that they put out of the Campe every leaper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is defiled by the dead,* Lev.5.2. *If a soul touch any unclean thing, whither it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or the carcase of unclean cattell, or the carcase of unclean creeping things,and if it be hidden from him, he also shall be unclean and guilty----* 6. *And he shall bring his trespasse-offering unto the Lord for his sin, which he hath sinned,* Lev.7.20. *But the soul that eateth of the sacrifice of the peace offerings that pertaineth to the Lord, having his uncleanneſſe upon him, even that soul shall be cut off from the people:* 21. *Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean thing, as the uncleanneſſe of man, or any unclean beast, or any abominable unclean thing, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which pertain unto the Lord, even that soul shall be cut off from his people.* In the which observe, that here the soul that shall touch any unclean thing is to be cut off; but *Num.*5.2. He is only to be put out of the Campe; now these were not killed that were put out of the Campe, and therefore to be cut off from the people must be a morall cutting off by Excommunication, not by death; also the word כרת signifieth to make a Covenant, to cut off, either by death or any other way, as by banishment, by which a thing leaveth off to be in use,though it be not destroyed, as when a branch is cut off a tree, 1 *Sam.*31.9. Yea,we have *Isa.* 50.1. אי זה ספר כריתות *Where is that Bill of cutting off or divorce:* Now this was not a Bill of killing the wife that was divorced, but putting her from her husband, as our Saviour saith, It is not Lawfull *to marry her that is divorced,* Matth. 19.9. A killed and dead woman is not capable of marriage; yet the word is, *Deut.* 24 1. Ier.3.8. from that same Theame, כרת: The Hebrews have another more ordinary word to signifie death,as *Exod.* 31.14. *He that doth any work on the Sabbath, in dying he shall die:* And it is expounded, he shall be cut off *from the midst of the people:* מקרב עמוה but *Lev.*7. the word כרת is four times used without any such expression, *ver.*20,21,25,27. To which may be added, that when zealous *Hezechiah* did finde that the people were not prepared, *According to the purification of the Sanctuary,* though they had celebrated the Passeover,the King did not only not kil them,

Cutting off not alwaies killing.

מות ומות *Ab interiore populorum sacrum*

but prayed, *God might be mercifull to them*, and the Lord *killed them not* (saith the spirit of God) *but healed them*; Exod.12.15. *He that eateth unleavened bread, that soul shall be cut off from Israel*: but it is expounded, ver.19. *That soul shall be cut off* מערת ישראל *from the Church of Israel*: Certainly, he that is killed is cut off from both State and Church, and from the company of all mortall men on earth, *Isa.*38.11. Then to be cut off from Israel is onely to be deprived of the comfortable society of the Church of *Israel*, as the holy Ghost expoundeth it: Also *Lev.*4. If any commit any sin but of ignorance, and so if he touch any unclean thing, or eat unleavened bread, forbidden of God, he is excluded from the holy things of God, while the Priest offer for him, according to the Law: Now if he was presently to be killed, either by the Magistrate, or in that act killed by Gods own immediate hand, as *Aarons sons* were, there was not a journey to be made to the place, the Lord had chosen to sacrifice there, which might have been three dayes journey from his house, who was unclean; yea, when the man that gathered sticks was stoned, and the false Prophet stoned, *Deut.* 13. there was no sacrifices offered for any of them before they were killed; and I hope, there were no sacrifices in *Moses* his Law offered for the dead. Hence learn we: 1. That to cut off from the Congregation, was not to kill, but it was the Iewish Excommunication greater or lesse: 2. That Moral sins, under the Old Testament debarred men from the holy things of God, while the Priests sacrificed for them, and brought them in a capacity to receive the holy things of God.

Morall guiltinesse excluded men from holy things amongst the Iews.

Leviticus 10.10. *The Priests were not to drink Wine*, when they went into the Tabernacle: *That ye may* (saith the Lord) *put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean*: Now *Haggai* expresly saith, cap.2.11,12. That it was the Priests part to put this difference, and so to admit to, or exclude *from the holy things of God.*

Hence for this cause it is said, as 2 *Chron.*23.19. *Iehoiada appointed the officers of the Lords house, so he set porters at the gates of the house of the Lord, that none which are unclean in any thing, might enter in*; so Ezra 9.21,22. *None did eat the Passeover, but such as were pure, and had separated themselves from the filthinesse of the Heathen of the land*; for this cause doth the Lord complain of the Priests,

Priests, Ezech. 22. 26. *Her Priests have violated my law, and have polluted my holy things, they have put no difference between the holy and the prophane; neither have they shewed the difference between the unclean and the clean,* Ezech. 44. 6. *And thou shalt say to the Rebellious, even to the house of* Israel, *thus saith the Lord God; O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations: 7. That ye have brought into my sanctuary, strangers uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary to pollute it, even my house, when ye offered my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my Covenant, because of all your abominations: 8. And ye have not kept the charge of my holy things: But ye have set keepers of my Charge in my Sanctuary for your selves. 9. Thus saith the Lord God, no stranger uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel*: Here is a complaint, that those that have the charge of the holy things, should suffer the holy things to be polluted: I grant it cannot bear this sense, that none should be admitted to be Members of the Visible Church under the *New Testament*, but such as are conceived to be regenerate; except it can be proved that the Sanctuary was a type of the visible Church: 2. That the *Apostles* constituted their Churches thus; but we read not in all the *New Testament* of any admission of Church Members at all: but only of baptizing of those who were willing to be baptized, and from this resulted the capacity of a Church Relation in all Churches visible: Nor, 2. Do we finde any shadow in all the word of God, of tryall of Church Members, by way of electing and chooſing of such and such, as qualified by reason of a conceived regeneration in the persons chosen, or of rejecting and refusing others as conceived to have no inward work of grace in them; this I believe can never be made good out of the word of God. 3. They must prove the Apostles admitted into the Sanctuary of the Visible Church *Ananias, Saphira, Simon Magus*, and others uncircumcised in heart, to pollute the holy things of God, and that the Apostles erred, and were deceived in the moulding of the first Apostolick Church in the world, which was to be a rule and pattern to all Churches in the New Testament, to all Ages: I deny not, but they might have erred according to the grounds of these, who urge the comparison for a Church of visible Saints, but that the Apostles *De facto* did

erre in their Election and judgement, in that wherein the holy Ghost holdeth them forth and their acts to be our rule and pattern, I utterly deny: I grant *Act.*15. In that Synod they did Act as men and Elders, not as *Apostles*, but that it could fall out, that they should actually erre, and obtrude false Doctrine instead of truth to the Churches in that Synod which is the first rule and pattern of Synods, I shall not believe.

But there is this Morall and perpetuall truth in these Scriptures; 1. That there are under the *New Testament*, some over the people of God in the Lord, some that *watch for their souls*, and govern them; as here there were *Priests*, *Levites* that taught and governed the people: 2. That the Rulers of the Churches, alwayes are to have the charge of the holy things; and to see that these holy things, the Seals and Sacraments and word of promise be not polluted, and that therefore they have power given them to debar such and such profane from the Seals, and so are to discern between the clean and the unclean, and this which the Prophet speaketh, *ver.* 9. is a prophecie never fulfilled after this in the persons of the people of God; therefore it must have its spirituall truth fulfilled under the *New Testament*, as is clear, ver.11. *Yet the Levites that are gone away far from me, shall be Ministers in my Sanctuarie, having charge at the gates of the House, and Ministering to the House*---- 14. *And I will make them keepers of the charge of the House, for all the service thereof, and for all that shall be done therein,* Ver. 15. *And the Priests and the Levites the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my Sanctuary, when the children of Israel went astray from me*---- *they shall enter into my Sanctuary, and they shall come neer to my Table to minister unto me, and to keep my charge*--- 23. *And they shall teach my people the difference betweene the holy and prophane, and cause men to discerne between the uncleane and the cleane.* 24. *And in controversie they shall stand in judgement, and they shall judge it according to my judgement, and they shall keepe my Lawes and my Statutes, in all mine assemblies, and they shall hallow my Sabbaths.* Now this Temple was another house, then *Solomons Temple*, as is evident out of the Text, it having roomes, dimensions, structures, so different that none can imagine them one house, and these chapters containe the division of the Holy Land, which after the captivity was never done, for:

The place *Ezekiel* 44. v. 11.12. 13.14. to be fulfilled under the New Testament.

for the ten Tribes never returned, and this Temple is clearely a type of the new *Ieruſalem*, and agreeth to that City ſpoken of, *Revelation*, chapters 21. and 22. As may appeare eſpecially by the foure laſt chapters of *Ezekiel*, and in the laſt words of the laſt chapter, *And the name of the city from that day ſhall be, The Lord is there.* And the Prieſts after the captivity as well as before brake the covenant of *Levi*, *Mal.* 2. And therefore I ſee it not fulfilled, except in the viſible Church of the New Teſtament, and in the Aſſemblies of *Chriſtian Churches*, *Mat.* 18. *Act.* 15. and the reſt of the Church-aſſemblies under the New Teſtament: As for the Lords perſonall raigne on earth, it is acknowledged there ſhall be no Church policy in it, no *Word*, *Sacraments*, *Ordinances*, *no Temple*, as they ſay from *Rev.* 21. 22. And with correction and ſubmiſſion, the *Prieſts and Levites*, that *Ezek.* 44. 15. are *ſaid to keep the charge of the Lords Houſe, when others went aſtray*, I take to be a prophecie of theſe Paſtors under the New Teſtament, to wit, *the Apoſtles of Ieſus Chriſt, and Paſtors*, and teachers that *Chriſt* left in his Church; for the edifying of his body, *Epheſ.* 4. 11. 12. *When theſe Scribes and Phariſes did ſit in Moſes his chaire* for a while, *Mat.* 23. but onely as porters and inferiour Officers in *Gods houſe*, yet they were to be heard, while God ſhould cut them off, as he prophecied, *Zach.* 11. 8.

Obiect. *We cannot ſay as ſome doe, that perſons were deprived amongſt the Iewes, of Church communion in the holy things of God, becauſe of Ceremoniall, not of Morall uncleannes, but now under the new Teſtament only Morall uncleannes can exclude perſons from the holy things of God; and therefore to argue from ceremoniall uncleannes in the old, to morall uncleanneſſe in the new, is no good conſequence.* I anſwer, the Ceremoniall uncleanneſſe in the Old, which did exclude from the holy things of God, doth ſtrongly conclude that morall uncleanneſſe under the *New Teſtament* doth exclude from the holy things of God, if that excluſion of the Leaper out of the campe ſeven dayes, and the touching of the dead, though imprudently, did typifie ſome other excluſion from the holy things of God, as no queſtion it did, then the conſequence muſt be ſtrong. 2. It is alſo falſe that morall uncleanneſſe did not exclude from the *holy things of God* under the Old Teſtament, For 1. what was more ordinary, then that ſacrifices ſhould be offered for ſins of igno-

Ceremoniall excluſion from holy things under the old, did typifie excluſion for morall uncleanneſſe under the New Teſtament. Levit. 5. 2.

ignorance, for trespasses, and while this was done, the person was not admitted to partake of the holy things of God. 2. Whence was the Lords frequent complaints of *wearying his soule with sacrifices, solemne assemblies, feast dayes, and new Moones*, when they were morally uncleane, *and their hands were full of blood, and they had not put away the evill of their doings, did not love judgement and justice*, Isaiah 10. 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19. And when *God* complaineth so of them, Ier. 7. 8. *Will ye steale, murther and commit adultery, and sweare falsely, and burne incense unto Baal, and walke after other Gods whom ye know not?* 10. *And come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my Name? Ergo*, Murtherers and adulterers were debarred from entring into the Congregation of the Lord, and partaking of the holy things of God, while they repented. Let none say by prophecying, or the keyes of knowledge in preaching the Word, they were declared unworthy to enter into the Temple; but that will not conclude that it was the Priests office by power of discipline to exclude them from coming unto the Sanctuary of God. *Ans.* But if the Porters were set at doores of the Lords house, to hold out the uncleane, and if the Lord charge the Priests with this crime, that they *Ezek.* 44. 8. *set keepers of the charge of the Lords house for themselves*, that is, for their owne carnall ends, and not for the honour of the Lord: And that *ver. 7. They brought into the Sanctuary of the Lords house uncircumcised in heart*, that is, such as were morally uncleane, then had the Priests a power to debarre from the Sanctuary such as were morally uncleane, and if the Priests are said *to beare rule by their meanes, Ier.* 5. 31. Then the Priests did beare rule and governe, though they abused their Power, and the word רדה signifieth to have dominion over any, *Psal.* 72. 8. *Psal.* 110. 2. 1 *Kin.* 4. 24. *Levit.* 26. 17. And the Scripture gives a power of judging and governing to the Priests. And 2 *Chron.* 30. 6, 7. The Posts that *Hezekiah* and the Congregation of Israel sent through the Land, commandeth a morall preparation to those that were to keepe the Lords Passeover, to wit, that *they should turne againe unto the Lord God of* Abraham, *and should not be like their Fathers, nor like their Brethren, that trespassed against the Lord God of their Fathers.* And ver. 11. *divers of Ashur, and Manasseh, and Zebulun humbled themselves, and came*

to

to Ierusalem to keepe the feast of the Passeover. This proveth clearly that people under the Old Testament were no lesse to try and examine themselves, by the King and Priests commandment, carried to them by Postes before they *should eate the Passeover*; then they are to try themselves before they eate and drinke at the Lords Supper: onely the adversaries say, *the Priests by preaching were to debarre from the Passeover those who were morally unclean, but not to debarre those who were morally uncleane, so they were not typically and ceremonially unclean, by any power of Discipline, or by Porters set at the gates to keepe them out of the Sanctuary.* But I answer, 1. How are the *Priests* Ezek. 22.26. *reproved for violating the Law of God, and prophaning his holy things, in that they put no difference between the holy and prophane, the clean and the unclean?* Surely the Priests prophaned in the *highest way, the holy things of God*, in admitting into the Sanctuary, those who were not onely ceremonially, but morally uncleane, as murtherers, adulterers, *Who cryed the temple of the Lord*, Ier. 7. And they *put no difference betweene the Holy and Prophane*, when they admitted to the holy things of God, and into the *Sanctuary the uncircumcised in heart*, for they doe more pollute the *holy things* of God, who partake of them being morally uncleane, and uncircumcised in heart, then those who are onely uncircumcised in flesh.

Object. *But the Church under the New Testament can no other way but morally, and by preaching* (as it would seeme) *onely debarre scandalous persons from the Seales and Prayers of the Church; for should a scandalous person, or an excommunicate person obtrude himselfe on the Lords Supper, against the will and sentence of the Church, the Church cannot use any bodily violence to hinder such prophane intrusion upon the holy things of God, because the Churches weapons are not carnall but spirituall; bodily violence can be no spirituall weapon, that the Church as the Church can use, so do the Remonstrant Arminians* argue, and some other for the congregationall way.

The Churches exclusion from the Seales declarative, not coactive by violence.

Remonstrant in Apollo.

Ans. This Argument is against all *Church-censures*, but though the Church as the Church cannot hinder scandalous intruders upon the holy things of God, by bodily violence, it doth not follow; *Ergo*, The Church can keep the holy things pure no way, but morally, that is, by preaching only, for we can give a third way: The rebukes,

Censures applied to some by name.

bukes, admonitions and Excommunication, or delivering to *Satan* are all transacted without any bodily and externall violence, Christs Kingdom resigneth all such carnall weapons to the Magistrate, who is the only Governour of the Church of Christ, as the Opponents say, All Church Censures are by way of Declaration, applied to such men by name; and there co-action, though penall, is not by bodily violence, but by acting upon the conscience of men and putting them to shame.

Arg.2. Hence 2. We argue, if beside the preaching of the word, in which Commandments, Promises and threatnings are proposed to all in generall; there be rebukes of the Church, the sentencing of such and such persons by name, as *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, and other Blasphemers; the Authoritative Declaration, that such a brother is to be esteemed as a *Heathen and a Publican*, and brotherly fellowship of eating and drinking with such an one denied, that he may be ashamed, if these be, then are some debarred from the holy things of God, by Church-Censures, beside the preaching of the word of God.

But the former is true; *Ergo*, so is the latter.

The Proposition is proved, because all wicked persons and heart-hypocrites are excluded from the holy things of God, by the Preaching of the Word: But only these that are notoriously, and by testimony of witnesses, convinced to be scandalous or contumacious in atrocious sins, after they are by name rebuked, and are declared to be esteemed as *Heathen and Publicans*; and from whom we are to withdraw brotherly fellowship, are excluded from the holy things of God, by Discipline and Church Censures.

The Assumption I prove: Because the word is preached to all by one in office, and that a Steward and dispenser of the mysteries of God, and he excludeth all unworthy ones known to be such, or invisible only, from the kingdom of God. But the Censure, 1. Is inflicted by many, 2 *Cor.*2.6. by the Church, *Matth.* 18.17. conveened together, 1 *Cor.*5 4. (2.) It is applied to such persons by name, 1 *Cor.*5.5. He that hath done such a deed, ver.2. *Hymeneus*, *Alexander*, 1 *Tim.* 1.20. *Jezabel*, *Rev.*2.20. (3) The whole congregation is not to eat or Table with such an one, 1 *Cor.*5.11. We are to *note and observe him, and to have no company with him, that he*

may

may b ashamed 2 Thes. 3. 14. *to esteeme him as an Heathen and a Publican*, and exclude him from the Seals of the Covenant, so long as he remaineth in that state.

3. *Arg.* If a person may for not hearing the Church, be judged as an *Heathen and a Publican, and his sinnes bound in heaven by the* Church; then by discipline he is excluded from the holy things of God in a peculiar way, in the which contumacious persons, *uncircumcised in heart* are excluded, *in foro interno Dei*, in Gods secret Court; But the former is true, *Matt.* 18. 15. 16, 17, 18. *Ergo* &c. Now if there be two Courts, one before God, *Rom.* 2. 16. *Rom.* 14. 4. 1 *Cor.* 14. 25. 1 *Ioh.* 3. 21. Another of the Church, *Mat.* 18. 15. 16, &c. 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 6, 11, 12. and two sorts of bindings, two sorts of Witnesses, two sorts of Sentences, then can it not be dedenyed but the Church hath a spirituall Court for censures, as well as for preaching the Word.

4. *Arg.* Exclusion of an offender from the societie of the Saints, and not to eate or drinke with him, is some other reall visible censure accompanied with shame, then any censure by the preaching of the Word; but there is such a censure inflicted by the Church, *Ergo*, The Proposition is cleare from *Rom.* 16. 17. *Now I beseech you brethren, marke them that cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which yee learned* καὶ ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ' αὐτῶν *and avoid them.* Here is a reall, visible, and personall note of shame put on Schismaticks, a bodily declining and avoiding of their company, which could not possibly be done by preaching of the Word. But (some may say) this was not done by the Church court, but every one as private christians were to eschew the society of Schismaticks, and by this you cannot conclude any Church-censure.

Answ. Not to say that it were unjustice to decline any, and renounce society with him, before he were convinced to be factious according to Christs order, *Mat.* 18. which to *Erastus* is a way of common and naturall equity. And so in order to some publique censure before the Church. *Paul* writeth to a constitute *Church* at *Rome*, in which he prescribeth *Rom.* 12. the Officers duty, as what Pastor, Doctor, Elder, Deacon, ought to doe in a Church-body; We cannot imagine he could command every private Christian to inflict the censure and punishment, (for a punishment it is in order to a publike sin) of avoiding any in Church

Eschewing the society of scandalous church members must be a church censure.

communion, professing *they serve the Lord Iesus Christ,* as these doe, *verse* 18. upon their owne private opinion: *Iesus Christ* and his *Apostles* must have left men loose in all order and discipline by this way, howbeit the adversary would deny a church punishment, here is a punishment inflicted by many, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. And it is not inflicted by way of preaching, so 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. *If any man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that man, have no company with him, that he may be ashamed,* σημειοῦσθε by the learned is to put a publike church note on him that he may be confounded, make him a σημειον, a publike wonder, that he may be ashamed, as *Piscator* and *P. Baynes* observe on the place expounding it of excommunication, and the same word μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε that is here, is used toward the incestuous man, who was to be excommunicated, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. I *Wrote unto you in an Epistle, not to keepe company with fornicators,* the word πορνεία ver. 1. is ascribed to the incestuous man, and here they are not to be mixed πόρνοις with fornicators, vers. 11. *But now I have written unto you not to keepe company, if any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or an extortioner, with such a one, no not to eate.* And that we may know that this is a church censure, he addeth ver. 12. *For what have I to doe to judge them also that are without? Ergo,* this no keeping company with such, is a Church judging.

5. *Arg.* The Church of *Pergamus* is rebuked for having amongst them, *such as hold the doctrine of Balaam,* and *Revel.* 2. 14. and *Thyatira,* that they *suffered Iezabel to preach and seduce the servants of God,* ver. 20. as the *Church of Ephesus* is praised v. 2. *that they cannot beare with them that are evill, but had tryed such that said they were Apostles, and were not, and had found them liars, Rev.* 2. 2. Here is it clearely supposed that these churches were to censure false teachers, if any shall say they were to censure them no other waies, but by preaching against their errors; 1. This would establish a Prelate above the Church contrary to that of *Mat.* 18. *Tell the Church,* and 1 *Cor.* 5. Where the *Church* gathered together was to excommunicate. 2. The *Angel* of the *Church* is taken collectively, for all the Rulers and the whole *Church* to whom Christ writeth, as is cleare, in that he saith so often; *He that hath an eare let him heare what the Spirit saith to the Churches, not to the Pastors only.* 2. The *removing of the Candlestick,* is not from the *Angel* but from the *Church;*

and

and repentance, and the fighting and overcomming, a reward of the crown of life, and many other things are evidently spoken to the *Churches*, not to the *Angels* of the *Churches*. And therefore the tryall of false Apostles must be by a Church, a Court, a colledge of church rulers, as *Paul* speaketh unto, *Act.* 20. 17. Where it is said, *Paul called the Elders of the Church of Ephesus*, and exhorted them to beware of false teachers, *that should not spare the flocke, and should teach perverse things*, v. 28. 29. 30. and of this sort were these lying and seducing Apostles, now how can one Angell or many Pastors by preachiug onely try *false Apostles, and finde them lyars?* This trying and sentencing of lying seducers, *Rev.* 2. 2. must be by a court, such as we find to be the practise of the Apostles and *Elders at Ieruſalem*, who in a Synod *Act.* 15. did finde these who taught a necessitie of Circumcision, to be perverters of soules and liars, saying, They had the *Apostles* authority for what they taught, whereas they had no such thing, and Schismatick troublers of the people, *Acts* 15. See what further I have said for Excommunication before, cap. 2. and sect. 7. which proveth also the same thing. The *Church of Thyatira* would not be rebuked for suffering *Jezabel* to teach, if they had no power of Church censures to hinder her; It is not enough to say that the *Angel of that Church did sufficiently hinder Jezabell to teach, when in publike he declared and preached against her false doctrine, and by the same reason Pastors exoner their conscience, if they preach that such and such scandalous persons are not to eate and drinke their owne damnation, though they debarre them not in a visible court by name from the Lords table, and though they never excommunicate them, and therefore there is not any censure but Pastorall rebukes by way of preaching, not any other by way of discipline.*

Ans. The Angel of Thyatira had not sufficiently hindered *Jezabel to seduce the servants of God*, by only preaching against her false doctrine, in regard that *Paul* and *Barnabas* not only hindred those that teached, that the *Gentiles ought to be circumcised*, Act. 14. cap. 16. by Preaching; but also had recourse to the power and authority of a Synod, that in a Synod which is a Court essentially consisting of many *Pastors* and *Elders*, they might be declared to be *perverters of souls*, and liars, as indeed they were judicially declared to be such, *Act.* 15. 24. Hence I argue; if the Apostles could not be said sufficiently to hinder *Jezabels* and Seducers, by only Preach-

The hindering of *Jezabel* by preaching onely not sufficient.

Preaching, and Disputing against their errors, except in case of their persisting in their errors, they should tell the Church convened in a Synod, as Christs order is, *Mat.* 18. *Then the Angel of Thyatira*, or any one Pastor do not sufficiently hinder scandals, but may be well said to suffer them by only private rebuking and publick Preaching, except they use all these means to hinder *Iezabels*, false Teachers, and all scandalous persons, that the Apostles used, and therefore the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira* must be rebuked for not using the Authority and power of the Church against *Iezabel*. And here by the way, when these false Teachers had sinned against their brethren in perverting their souls, they take not the course that *Erastus* dreameth to be taken according to *Matth.* 18. They complain not to the *Synedrim*, or Civill Magistrate, who should use the sword against them, but to the Church Synodically convened at *Ierusalem*, who used against them the Spirituall power that Christ the head of the Church had given them.

Debarring of the scandalous from the seals proved.

6. *Arg.* If there be an Ecclesiasticall debarring of scandalous persons from the holy things of God, especially from the Supper of the Lord by Censures, and not by the preaching of the word only, then there be Censures and power of jurisdiction in the word beside preaching of the word. But the former I make good by these following Arguments.

1. *Arg.* If the Stewards and dispensers of the mysteries of God, are *to cut the Word aright as approved Workmen*, 2 Tim. 2. 15. *And are to give every one their portion of bread according to their need, and measure*, Matth. 24. 45, 46, 47. 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. 2. 3. and *must not slay the souls which should not die*, by denouncing wrath against the righteous, nor save the souls alive that should not live, by lying words, *Ezec.* 13. 19. by offering mercy to the wicked and impenitent, then as they should not deny the seals of salvation to Believers, hungring and thirsting for Christ; neither should they give the seals of life to those that are walking openly in the way of destruction.

But the former is true; *Ergo*, so is the latter. The Proposition is clear: As the word should not be divided aright, if wrath should be Preached to believing Saints, and life and salvation offered to the obdurate and wicked, so neither should the *Stewards cut the seals* of the word aright, if the Supper were given to wicked men: If they should say, *This is the blood of the Covenant, shed for the*

Remission of your sins, Drink ye all of it: They should save alive those that should *die, with lying words*; for the seals speak to the Communicant, and apply to him in particular, the very promise that in generall is made to him; and this will prove as the Magistrate being no Steward of the word, and not called of God thereunto, as *Aaron* was *Heb.*5.4. can no more distribute the word and seals to whom he pleaseth, *Ex officio*, then he can Preach and Administer the Sacraments, nor should another man, who is no Steward, but a Porter or Cook, Teach, and that by his office now, and to whom the Steward should distribute Bread: nor is it sufficient, to say, by this one man, not the Church, is to debar from the Sacraments, for the seals being proper to the Church, as the Church, he must act here, in, and with the power of the Church. 2. It is another question, whether by the Minister, or by the Church any ought to be debarred, and whether there be any such Censure as debarring from the Seals; and its another question, by what power, whether by the power of order, or by the power of jurisdiction, Ministers may debar the scandalous from the seals; I conceive by both powers, they may keep the Ordinances pure; and if it belong to the Magistrate to debar any more then to preach the word, and by the way of *Erastus*: The Magistrate by his office, as he is a Magistrate only is deputed of Iesus Christ to Steward the seals to whom he pleaseth: *Ergo*, (say I) to cut the word aright to whom he pleaseth, must be his due.

It belongeth not to the Magistrate to debar from the seals.

2. *Arg.* As the dispensers of the word must not partake of other mens sins, 1 *Tim.* 5.22. so neither should they distribute to wicked and scandalous men, such Ordinances, as they see shall certainly be judgement and damnation to them, and as maketh the Communicants *guilty of the body and blood of our Lord:* Now that the Stewards Communicate with the sins of these manifestly scandalous, to whom they administrate the Supper: I prove: 1. Because they that *sow pillows under the head* of the openly wicked, preaching peace to these *who should die, do hunt souls, Ezech.* 13.20. and partake of their presumption, *and they that heal the wound of the people with smooth words*, are false dealers, and concurreth to the wound of the people, *Ier.*8.10,11. As the Prophet that preacheth lies partaketh of the peoples presumption; which believe those lies, *Ier.*14.14,15,16. 2. If *Eve* should but reach the fruit of the for-

forbidden Tree to *Adam*, and say take and eat, she partakes of *Adams* sin, if the mother give poyson willingly and wittingly to a childe, she killeth her childe, though it be told the childe that it is poyson: The Supper to those who knowingly to us, eat unworthily, is forbidden meat, and poyson.

3. A third Argument is, from the nature of holy things. *It is not lawfull to give that which is holy to dogs, nor to cast pearles before swine, least they trample them under their feet*, Matth.7.6. But the Sacraments are holy things, saith *Erastus*, and no man can deny it; *Ergo*, we are not to give the Sacraments to the scandalous and openly prophane.

Thomas Erastus lib.3. confirmat. Thesium lib.3.c.3. pag.207. *Nam et sacramenta sub sub τῶ ἁγίῳ nomine comprehendi concedo.*

But *Erastus* answereth, *That the Lord preached the Word to Pharisees, and the Word is a holy thing, and a pearl, and by Dogs, and swine, he meaneth open persecutors. They that will seem members of the Church, and confesse their fault, and promise amendment, are not such as will trample on the Sacraments, and will turn again to tear you: Et si quis talis reperiatur hunc ego admittendum minime censeo*, for such (saith he) *Are not to be admitted to the Sacrament.*

Ans. These holy things, which prophane men and openly scandalous can make no use of, but pollute them to their own destruction, and the abusing of the Ordinances, no more then Dogs and Swine can make use of Pearls to feed them, but onely trample on them, are not to be given to the prophane and openly scandalous: But the Lords Supper is such a thing, being Ordained only for those that have saving Grace, not for Dogs. Now the Assumption applied to the word, is most false, (as it is applied to the Lords Supper, it is most true) for the Word is Ordained by speciall Command to be Preached to Dogs and Lions, that thereby they may be made *Isa.* 11.4,5,6,7. *Isa.* 2.3,4. Lambs and Converts; the Supper is not a mean of Conversion; and since Dogs can make no use of it, but trample it under foot, we are forbidden to give such holy things to them. It is true, They'll trample the Pearl of the word; but we are Commanded to offer the word to all, even while they turn Apostates. 2. If *Christ* Commanded the word to be Preached to Pharisees and Saduces; these were such persecuters as sinned against the Holy Ghost, Dogs in the Superlative degree, *Matth.* 12. 31, 32. *Joh.* 9. 39,40,41. *Joh.* 7. 28. *Joh.* 8. 21. *Ergo, Christ* Commanded

manded some holy things, the word to be given to Dogs; and yet his precept cannot be obeyed, if we give them the Sacrament. 3. By what Doctrine of Scripture will *Erastus* have these that trampleth on Ordinances, and turn again to tear us, debarred from the Supper? For in his *Thes.* 26. 27,28,29. he holdeth it unlawfull to debar any *Judas* from the Supper; doth he think there be no Dogs in the Visible Church? *Peter* saith, *There be such Dogs as have known the way of truth*, and turn to their vomit; and such may promise amendment, confesse their sin, and desire the Sacrament.

4. *Arg.* Those *who will not hear the Church*, but doth scandalize, not only their Brethren, but also a whole Church, and are to be esteemed as Heathen and Publicans, are not to be admitted to the highest priviledge, and to feast with *Christ*, when the *Church* knoweth they want their wedding garment: But there may be, and are many in the *Church* of this sort; *Ergo*, such should not be admitted: For the Major, I set down the words of *Erastus* granting it. The Assumption, both Scripture and experience proveth; for there be in the Visible Church, Dogs, Persecuters, Jezabels, *as there be many called, and few chosen.*

Erastus, Confi. thes. l. 3. c. 3. pag. 207. *Qui membra externæ volunt ecclesiæ videri, illi non calcabunt Sacramenta nec offerentem laniare tentabunt, & siquis talis reperiatur hunc ego minime admittendum censeo.*

5. *Arg.* If the incestuous man must be cast out, lest he leaven the Church, then can he not be admitted to Communicate with the Church, in that which is the highest seal of Christs love; but the incestuous man must be cast out, lest he leaven the whole Church; 1 *Cor.* 5. 4,5, &c. *Ergo*, The Proposition is clear, because none can be put out of the Church, but they must be separated from the Table of the Children of the Church; the Assumption is 1 *Cor.* 5 13; ἐξαίρετε *Put him out*, ver. 7. *Purge him out.* Now the Church hath no power by bodily violence to attempt a locall separating of him in person from them, as they are men, though they may separate themselves from him; then it must be a declarative casting of him out, as unworthy to Communicate with the Church in such holy Ordinances, as distinguisheth the Church from other Societies, and these be the Seals of the Covenant.

6. We are not to suffer sin in any, *Levit.* 18. 17. *Rev.* 2. 20. but to hinder it so far as we can according to our vocation, 1 *Sam.* 3. 13. As the Priests hindred *Uzziah* to Sacrafice, 2 *Chron.* 26. 18,19,20. And must pull them out of the fire, *Jude* ver. 23. As the

Law

Law of nature would teach the Mother, not only, not to co-operate with her sonne attempting to kill himself; but to hinder and stop him by pulling a knife or sword out of his hand, when he is about to destroy himself; if so, then ought not the Church and her Officers to co-operate so far with those who do *Eat and drink their own Damnation*, as to exhibite and give to such the seals of the Covenant, to pray that these seals may be blessed to scandalons ones, which is to pray directly contrary to the revealed *Will of God* in his word, and against that which the faithfull Pastors and *Paul* Preacheth, That every one should try and examine themselves, and so eat and drink: Now a reall and physicall co-operating of the Church, with such manifest impiety, must then be the Churches suffering of sin in a brother, or not hindring him ro eat his own Damnation; if the Lord have committed a power of dispensing the seals to Christians, not to Pagans and Turks: Let *Erastus* show any precept or practise, why we might not admit *Jews, Turks, Indians*, though never Baptized, to eat and drink the Lords body and blood, (we are to Preach the Gospel to them, if they were amongst us) except that such as are to communicate according to the will of *Christ*, are Christians, members of the Church, who doth try and examine themselves; and *Jews* and *Turks* though dwelling and born amongst us are not such, yet *Erastus* would that such should never be admitted to the Lords Supper, though they should desire it: Officers also have a command not to dispense some parts of the word to all, as we are not to rebuke open Scorners: Should any of our Church turn Iew and blaspheme Christ, and pertinaciously after conviction persist in his Apostacy; might not *Erastus* aske by what command of Christ will ye not Preach the Gospel to such an one? Christ made no exception, but said, *Preach to all Nations, Why do you make Exceptions?* might we not answer, Christ hath given a power of dispensing the Gospel to all; yet hath he excepted some, because its against the will of Christ that such can obey the Gospel: We are bidden pray for all, yet are there some that we are not to pray for, because they sin unto death: so is the case here in some kinde.

7. It is for our instruction that the Priests were rebuked, for that they admitted into the *Sanctuary the uncircumcised in flesh and heart*, that they put no difference *betweene the cleane and the unclean*

cleane, and prophaned the holy things of God, Ezek. 44. 9. *Ezek.* 22. 26. *Hag.* 2. 11, 12, 13. And this was a shadow of things to come, as was observed before, teaching us, that farre lesse should the Pastors of the New Testament suffer the holy things of God to be prophaned.

8. We read that I*ohn Baptist* and the *Apostles* baptized none but such as confessed their sinnes, and professed faith in *Iesus Christ*, it would then appeare to be the will of Christ, that every one should not be admitted to the *Lords Supper*, though some say, the Apostles baptized single persons not in Church communion, so that Pastors administer the Sacraments by reason of the power of order, as they are Pastors, not by power of jurisdiction, as having warrant from any Church, in regard Churches at the beginning had the Word and Sacraments before they had any Church Government, yet I conceive the Lords Supper is a Seale of a Church-communion, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 17. and the like I say of Baptisme typed by *Noahs* Arke, 1 *Pet.* 3. 19, 20, &c. and though the Apostles, partly by priviledge, partly through necessitie, the parts existing before the whole, were necessitated first to baptize, and then to plant Churches, yet the Churches being once constitute, these are, Church priviledges to be dispensed both by the power of order, and the power of jurisdiction.

CHAP. VI. Quest. 2.

Some speciall Reasons of Thomas Erastus *against Excommunication, examined.*

THomas *Erastus* a Physitian, who medled not much with Divinity, save in this, in which he was unsound, in his reply to *Beza* laboureth to make Excommunication a dreame, and nothing but a device of Pastors affecting domination.

Confirmatio Thesium Erast. Confir. thes. l. 1. c. 1. p. 72.

1. Object. *Onely* Pet r *killed* Ananias; *onely* Paul *excommunicated* Alexander *and* Hymeneus, *onely* Paul *said he would come to the Corinthians with the rod, and for a long time onely Bishops excommunicated, Presbyters gave advise onely.* Ergo; *This power is not in the Church.*

Anſ. The conſequence is naught, Chriſt ſaid only to his Diſciples in perſon, *Go teach and Baptize*, Is it a good conſequence therefore, that none hath power to *teach* and *Baptize*, but only the *Apoſtles?* Only *Paul* exhorted the *Corinthians*, to mourn for the inceſtuous mans fall, therefore no Paſtors have power to exhort in the like kinde. 2. We grant the *Apoſtles* did many things out of their Apoſtolick power, which in a conſtitute Church, the Church onely may doe, as *Paul* his alone diſputed againſt Circumciſion of the Gentiles, *Act.* 15. 2. What? *Ergo*, *Paul* in a Synod, and a Synod hath not power to diſpute and determine the ſame, the contrary is evident, *Act.* 15. 12, 22, 23. 3. It is falſe that the Authority and rod, with which *Paul* ſaid he would come to the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. was proper only to *Paul an Apoſtle*, the ſame he giveth to *Timothy*, and to all the Elders. 3. If Biſhops exerciſed the ſame power for many ages, *Eraſtus* muſt ſhew us Biſhops who could kill miraculouſly, ſuch as *Ananias* and *Elimas*, and work miracles; now beſide that, *Eraſtus* muſt with his new opinion, hold up a new creature called a Prelate, unknown to the Apoſtles or *Ierome* and the *Fathers*, he muſt parallel Biſhops for working of miracles to *Paul* and the Apoſtles.

Eraſt. will have no man excluded from the Sacraments *pag.* 86. *Si per ſubductionem pabuli intelligis verbi aut ſacramentorum negationem, de tuo hoc dicis, non loqueris cum ſcripturis, quæ nuſquam jubent pabula hæc ſubducere.*

Obj. 2. *The Apoſtles declared many to be excluded out of the kingdom of heaven, and ſo bound in heaven whom they did not excommunicate from the Sacraments, ſo alſo do the Miniſters daily, and yet Chriſt in his Word commanded not thoſe to be debarred from the Lords Supper.*

Anſ. It is very true, the Apoſtles and Paſtors of Chriſt that now are, denounce eternall wrath, and that authoritatively againſt thoſe that are inviſibly to men heart-hypocrites, who yet before the Church (who know not the heart) go for Saints, and are neither excluded from Sacraments, nor ſo much as rebuked. But it is a vain collection, that therefore externally ſcandalous are not to be debarred from the Supper, and Excommunicated: The Prophets, 1 *Cor.* 14. did preach that Heathens remaining Heathens were excluded out of the Kingdom of God; yet Heathens cannot be Excommunicated; and yet (I hope) *Eraſtus* dare not deny, but Chriſt hath forbidden, that Heathen remaining Heathen be admitted to the Sacraments: Though I dare provoke any *Eraſtian*, and atteſt them by their new Doctrine, to ſhew me a warrant from Chriſts Teſtament, why the Church ſhould refuſe the Seals to a *Turke*; they will

will say, *A Turk is not willing to receive, and therefore the Seals may be denied to him, and yet cannot be denied to a member of the Church though scandalous, if he desire it, and professe repentance.*

According to *Erastus* his way we cannot deny the seals to a Turk.

But I answer, Though a Turk be unwilling to receive the Seals; What if he should be willing, and require to be Baptized, yet remaining ignorant of Christ and the Gospel we should not Baptize him: Now by the Doctrine of *Erastus*, we have no more warrant to deny the seals to him, then to deny them to *Judas*; we desire a Scripture from the adversary, which will not conclude with equall strength of reason against the giving of the seals to any scandalous member of the Church; it is true, a Turk ignorant of Christ, though he should desire the seals is uncapable, and he is unwilling vertually, in regard he as yet refuseth the knowledge of the Gospel, and so is the scandalous professor no lesse uncapable (though we may grant degrees of incapacity) for he is vertually unwilling to receive Christ in regard he is unwilling to part with his idol-sins: 2. Though a Turk should be unwilling (as its like enough he will be) yet we desire a Scripture, why we cannot make offer of the Sacraments to a Turk, and yet we may Preach the Gospel and make offer of Christ in the word to him, 1 *Cor.*14.23. And this Scripture shall also conclude, we are not to admit scandalous persons to the Sacraments, being both uncapable of them, as also because they can but trample on these pearls,, no lesse then the Turk should do; the Argument then is just nothing: We exclude many from the Kingdom of Heaven, whom we do not excommunicate on earth; But he should say, we Excommunicate many, whom we do not exclude out of Heaven.

Erastus. *These two are not one, to declare a person hatefull in Heaven to God, and to be cast out of the visible Church; for if they be both one, then one private Pastor may Excommunicate, for he may declare from Gods Word, that an offender is excluded out of Heaven: hath not the Word of God in the mouth of one as much authority and power as out of the mouth of many? the authority of the Word dependeth not on a multitude, also why should this be as good a consequence (God judgeth not this man worthy of the Kingdom of God; Ergo, he is to be cast out of the visible Church) as this (God judgeth not this man worthy of life eternall: Ergo, God will not have him to live in this temporall life) Are we ignorant that God esteemeth many not* P.75,76.

To exclude men from the Kingdom of Heaven not one with Excommunication

Worthy of life eternall, to Whom he hath given power to cast out devils in his name? Matth. 7.

Ans. All this is but with carnall reason to speak against the wayes of God; for 1. Not every denouncing of a sinner unworthy of Heaven is Excommunication: So *Judas* might have Excommunicated himself, and when one Pastor declareth an offender unworthy of Heaven; he is not formally excommunicated out of the visible Church; he is cast out of the invisible Church: But that is not Excommunication, except it be done for a publick scandall that offendeth the Church: 2. Except it be done by the visible Church. 3. According to the rule of Christ, *Matth.* 18. 4. That he may be ashamed, and repent and be saved: Gods binding of the offender in Heaven, is a part of Excommunication, but not all, nor the very same with Excommunication. 2. The Churches casting out for Christs institutions cause, is of more Authority then the Conscionall casting out performed by one Pastor, and yet the Conscional casting out by one, *in suo genere* is as valid as the other, *subordinata non pugnant.* 3. We are not to take our compasse and rule of Gods waies by his outward dispensation, but the revealed will of Christ is our Rule, God thinketh *those Who Walketh inordinately, and causeth divisions, not* worthie of the Christian society of the Saints; and must binde them in heaven to that censure, in regard he expressly so commandeth in his Word, *Rom.* 16, 17. 18. 2 *Thes.* 3. 14, 15. 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. Yet he thinketh them worthy of Salvation, and may give repentance and *Iesus Christ* to many of these; he may deny salvation to the wicked, and upon that *feed them to the day of slaughter*, dare flesh and blood quarrell this consequence? *God hath appointed the Wicked for the day of Wrath.* Ergo, *he giveth them more of this life then heart can wish.* This consequence dependeth on the meer dispensation of God, nor is this our Consequence. God judgeth such unworthy of heaven; *Ergo*, they must be cast out of the visible Church, we never made Excómunication a necessary consequent of the Lords judging men unworthy of Heaven, for then all these that God judgeth unworthy of life eternall should be excommunicated, and only these, which is false; for God may judge some worthy of life eternall in Christ, and yet they are to be excommunicated, if they *refuse to hear the Church*, as many regenerate may go that far in scandalous obstinacy, and many whom God judges unwor-

unworthy of life eternall, may so belie a Profession, as they deserve not to be excommunicated, and both these may fall out, and do fall out according to the revealed will of Christ.

Erastus 4. objecteth. *Excommunication must exclude men from only the externall society of the Church, for he only can joyne us to Christ, or separate us from internall and spirituall society of Christ, who can beget lively faith in us, and extinguish lively faith when it is begotten, for by faith only we are made living members of Christs body, and by only infidelity we leave off to be members of his bodie: But no Church, no creatures can either beget lively faith in us, or extinguish it in us: or thus, men can neither give to us, nor take from us salvation, therefore Excommunication should not be defined by cutting men off from salvation.* Pag. 78.

Ans. This is the only Argument of *Erastus*, that seemeth to bear weight; But it is false and groundlesse, it supposeth the false principle that *Erastus* goeth on, that Excommunication is a reall separation of a member from Christs Invisible and Mysticall body, and that the Excommunicated person who may be an Invisible member of *Christ*, and regenerated, may be an Apostate, and fall from *Christ*, and leave off to be a member. The contrary of which all our Protestant Divines teach against Papists; whereas, Excommunication is only a Declarative; but withall, an Authoritative Act or Sentence of the Church, and no reall cutting off of a believer from Christ: But you will say, *It presupposeth a cutting off in heaven from Christ; and therefore the Excommunicated person is declared to be cut off.* Let me Answer, I conceive Excommunication hath neither Election nor Reprobation, Regeneration or non-Regeneration, for its object, or *terminus*, but only it cutteth a contumacious person off from the Visible *Church* on earth, and from the head *Christ* in heaven, not in regard of his state of Regeneration, as if Christ ratifying the Sentence in heaven, did cut him off so much as conditionally from being a member of his body: No, but in regard of the second Acts of the life of God, and the sweet efficacy and operation of the spirit, by which the Ordinances are lesse lively, lesse operative, and lesse vigorous, the man being as the Learned and Reverend Mr. *Cotton* saith, *As a palsie Member*, in which life remaineth, but a little withered and blunted, and he in Satans power to vex his spirit, and therefore I grant all, to wit, that

Excommunication is no reall separation of one from Christs invisible body.

that Excommunication is not a reall separating of a member from *Christs* body, only unbelief doth that; but it followeth not, *Ergo*, it is a separation only from the externall society of the *Church*: For 1. This externall cutting off, is ratified in heaven: And 2. *Christ* hath ratified it by a real internal suspension of the influence of his spirit in heaven: But I deny that this universall doth follow from Christs binding in heaven, *That whomever God judgeth unworthy of heaven, all these are to be cast out of the Church*; he cannot prove this consequence from our grounds.

Pag. 79. *Erastus* Argueth thus: *If God dam any as a sinner in heaven, he will have the Elders to cast him out of the Church Visible in earth, so they know him to be such; yet this is not sure.*

Ans. It is most sure, so all the Church know him (Elders only Iudicially Excommunicate, the people also by consent, and by Execution of the Sentence, and avoiding the offender) and if it be Iudicially proved, the Church is to Excommunicate. But 1. he must not be without the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5.12. Though the Church know *Turks* and *Pagans*, and those who live without *Christ*, to be damned in heaven; yet they Excommunicate them not, for they are without the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. and yet damned, *Act.* 4. 12. 2. They may know many unregenerated, *Ioh.* 15. 18. Yet they cannot Excommunicate them for non-regeneration, or non-election to glory, which they cannot know judicially, except they be externally scandalous, *Matth.* 18. 17. 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. 2.

P. 81, 82. Erastus, *By Preaching, Drunkards are excluded out of Heaven, and God declareth by the Preaching of the Word, that they are not of the faithfull on earth; but you cannot prove these four from Scripture.* 1. *That God hath Commanded to cast them out of the Church, whom he hath judged unworthy of life Eternall.* 2. *That they should not be admitted to the Sacrament, who have polluted themselves with some sin, though they say they repent, except it please the Elders.* 3. *That it is Gods will that they be debarred from the Sacrament, by the voyces of a Court of Elders.* 4. *That God hath Commanded such a Court of Elders under a Christian Magistrate, who should have a power of jurisdiction, different from the power of the Magistrate.*

Ans. 1. Declaring by Preaching, that a Drunkard is not of the number of the faithfull in the Visible Church, is materially Excommunication: This *Erastus* saith, We want only a Court of Elders:

Elders: But how proveth he that one Paſtor ſhould caſt out of the Church by Preaching, all thoſe that God judgeth unworthy of life eternall. *Eraſtus* ſaith, A Presbytery cannot do this: 1. *Becauſe the heart is known to God only*, pag. 83. And doth one ſingle Paſtor know the heart, and a Senate of Paſtors knoweth it not? 2. Muſt Paſtors know the heart, which God only knoweth, 2 *Chron.* 29, 30. *Ier.* 17. 10. Otherwiſe they cannot judicially Excommunicate, and one Paſtor may by way of Preaching, Excommunicate, and yet he knoweth not the heart. 3. For the firſt of his four, we need not prove it, we aſſert it not. 4. Though a *Turk* or an *Apoſtate* ſhould ſay that he repents, yet he lyes; and *Eraſtus* ſaith, l. 3. cap. 3. pag. 207. *Hunc ego minimè admittendum cenſeo. I think ſuch a one is not to be admitted to the Sacrament.* 5. What Chriſt ſaith, *Matth.* 18. we take to be Gods will. 6. If there were no *Chriſtian Magiſtrate*, belike a *Church-Court* might excommunicate; and ſhall the Magiſtrate, becauſe Chriſtian, ſpoil the Church of the power ſhe had while ſhe wanted a Magiſtrate? 7. The power of Excommunicating, and binding and looſing in earth and heaven, muſt then be principally in the Magiſtrate: And who gave the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Magiſtrate?

Eraſtus. *If Excommunication be a cutting off from Salvation: then all who are Excommunicated muſt periſh; But many Excommunicated perſons are ſaved, many relaxed are Condemned.*

Anſ. We define not ſo Excommunication: Nor did *Beza* put mens Salvation in hazard, becauſe they are Excommunicated ſo they repent, if their *ſins be retained in Heaven*, and they never repent. Let *Eraſtus* ſee how they ſhall be ſaved. 2. Thoſe againſt whom one Paſtor denounceth the juſt deſerved wrath of God, are Conſcionally cut off from Salvation: But many of thoſe are ſaved. Let *Eraſtus* Anſwer this himſelf.

Eraſtus. *He only can caſt out of the Church who ſeeth the heart; But men, or the Church, ſeeth not the heart;* Ergo, *men can do no more but debar from the Sacraments: It is not enough to ſay, that whom they caſt out, as the Ambaſſadors of God in the name of Chriſt, declaring thoſe to be bound on earth, whom Chriſt hath bound in heaven are excommunicated: for the Argument is not, whether Paſtors may pronounce on earth, that which God hath ratified in Heaven; but whether they may ſo caſt out of the Church, as they may cut men off from Salvation; and whether one Paſtor may not do this, no leſſe then a Presbytery.* Pag. 83.

Anſ. So I may Argue a Prophet cannot warn a wicked man, that he ſhall dye eternally: becauſe a Prophet in ordinary, knoweth not the heart more then a Senate of prophets, yet are all prophets to exclude from Salvation, wicked and impenitent men, but conditionally, ſo they repent not, in which God goeth before them, *Ezech.* 3. 18,19,20. *Cap.* 33. 6,7. *Act.* 20. 20. Nor are we to doubt, but all Prophets to the end of the world muſt do the ſame. 2. If men debar from the Sacraments, as having warrant from *Chriſt*, they do alſo exclude men from *Chriſt* and Salvation offered in the Word; and is there not need that Paſtors ſee the heart, if they exclude men from Chriſt and Salvation in the Word and Seals, as from Salvation ſimply? And how can men know binding in Heaven, more then the hearts of men on earth? The one is as far from our intuitive knowledge, as the other, except that we know both by fruits and effects; otherwiſe, this is but a Popiſh Argument, if the Church do binde on earth, as God bindeth in Heaven, ſay *Stapleton, Becanus, Suarez, and other Papiſts*; *then muſt the Church be infallible in judgement:* But we deny the Conſequence in the one, as in the other. 2. It is that which offendeth *Eraſtus*, 1. That a Senate, not one man doth this. 2. That the Chriſtian Magiſtrate doth it not: But I pray you, doth one Paſtor, or the Chriſtian Magiſtrate know the heart; but a Presbytery cannot do it, becauſe a Presbytery knoweth not the heart: Is not this too partiall Logick?

Pag. 86. Eraſtus. *Many Excommunicated perſons have repented in the end of their life, and dyed devoutly; then he who is caſt out of the Viſible Society of the Church, is not caſt out of the internall and ſpirituall Society of Chriſt.*

Anſ. This is as much againſt Chriſts words, as againſt us; may not many whoſe ſins are bound in heaven, and againſt whom the Paſtors denounce excluſion out of heaven, *repent in the end of their life, and die devoutly?* Ergo, The very threatnings of the Goſpel muſt be wind, and by theſe, none are excluded from Heaven. 2. Excommunication is but a conditionall excluding out of Heaven; if men repent, the condition not being placed, *Nihil ponitur in eſſe*, they are ſaved; though it may fall out that they want the externall relaxation of the Church, not through their own fault, but by ſome externall providence inſuperable to them.

But

But it is to beg the Question, to say, *Those that are justly Excommuniated, and seek not to be reconciled to the Church, do repent and die devoutly.* Beza saith, *Pastors should give food to the hungry sheep, though they know not the moment when they do repent.* Erastus Replyeth, *Then give Word and Sacraments to those who seek them.*

Ans. This is more Charity then the Scripture knoweth, belike Erastus *will have all those that seek God daily, and delight to know his wayes, and ask for the Ordinances of Iustice, and take delight in approaching to God, to be all hungry souls, hungring for Righteousnesse, and so blessed,* Matth. 5.6. Luk. 1. 52. Isa. 55. 1. Whereas *Isaiah* saith, They may do all that, and be but plaistred Hypocrites, *Isa.* 58. 1,2,3,4,5,6.

Erastus. *But if the Excommunicated man repent, whether soon or late, he was never cut off from inward communion with Christ, for then the elect might perish; if* David *and* Manasseh *had been excommunicate, and died, they had been saved, except we deny the perseverance of the Saints.*

Ans. Erastus evidenceth, he hath little skill in Divinity, he thinks a regenerate man not capable of Excommunication, why? and the sad falls of *David, Peter* and others prove, they may fall in as great sins, as *not hearing of the Church* 2. If one repent in his death, as the repenting Theef, will that infer he was never all his life separated from Christ? The contrary is true and cleare in the *Ephes.* 2. 11, 12, 13. *Tit.* 3.3. 1 *Tim.* 1. 13,14,15. 3. This is as strong (as it is weake as water) against all the threatnings denounced against such sinners as the Lord gifteth with Repentance, for Excommunication to the regenerated is a sort of Evangelick conditionall threatning.

Erastus. *To give internall communion with Christ is a spirituall thing,* Ergo, *The Church cannot take it from any, and that same power that giveth, taketh away, then the Presbytery cannot by loosing, give salvation, nor by binding, take it away. Excommunication on earth is nothing, except God binde first in heaven, then it is but a declaration of what God doth, to shew the sentence that another judge hath given out, is not to judge; there is a difference betweene those that by authority give out a sentence, and those who as servants doth promulgate the sentence. So* Luther tom. German. 1. fol. 239. *Excommunicare non est, ut quidam opinantur, animam Satanæ tradere, & pre-* Pag. 88. 89

 cum

cum fructu à piis factarum spoliare. Nam ubi vera fides & charitas in corde remanent, etiam vera communio Dei, & precum Christianitatis fructus permanent, postquam aliud est excommunicatio, nec fieri aliud potest, quam privatio externi Sacramenti, ac commercii cum hominibus ac si in custodiam traditus externâ amicorum consuetudine priver, amore & favore eorum interea non spolier.

Ans. This is but the old argument of *Erastus*, repeated almost a hundred times to please the people. We never taught that either Presbytery or Minister can give, or take away inward Communion with God. But hence it will not follow, that Excommunication is an empty thing, for all we doe is but a Ministery, *Christ* doth make the whole Gospel, promises, threatning, Sacraments, effectuall, else, *What is Paul? What is Apollo? but the Ministers by whom ye beleeve?* And what is the *planting of* Paul, or the *watering of* Apollo, except God give the increase? If this anull Excommunication, because Excommunicators are not properly judges, but onely Servants and Heralds to declare what Christ doth in Heaven, then may *Erastus* prove that the Word, Promises, threatnings of the Gospel; The Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers are nothing, for all of themselves are meere declarations of Gods will. 2. Those who Excommunicate because they judge not, but declare the will of Christ, they are not for that void of all authority, for their declaration is authoritative. What did *Ieremiah* but declare Gods will, yet it is such a prophetical and authoritative declaration, as I conceive. *Baruch* or any other not sent as a Prophet of God, could not beare that which God putteth on *Ieremiah, c.* 1. 10. *See, I have this day set thee over the Nations, and over the Kingdomes to root out, and to pull downe, to destroy, and to pull downe, to build and to plant:* Hath *Ieremiah* no Prophetical authority over the Nations and Kingdomes to whom he prophesieth in the Name of the Lord, to build and destroy, to root out, and to plant, because he declareth and prophesieth, that such Nations shall be destroyed and rooted out for their wickednes, and such shall be builded and planted? Then meer declaration saith nothing against Excommunication; *Paul*, saith he, and the rest of the Apostles were nothing *but Ministers*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 5. and yet authoritie they had, else he could not say, 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. *We have in readinesse vengeance against all disobedience*, Verse 8. *For though*

Though Excommunication be onely declarative, yet it is not empty.

I *should boast somewhat more of our Authority*, &c. *I should not be ashamed*, and 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. *Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ*, but I pray you 1 *Cor.* 12. 29. Are all *Apostles*? Are all *Prophets*? Are all *Teachers*?

3. What *Luther* saith is true, Excommunication can put none out of the state of saving Faith and inward Communion with God, nor doth deprive men of the fruit of the Prayers of the godly, for the godly pray that Excommunication may be medicine effectually blessed of God, for the saving of the mans soul, yea, Gods not hearing of the prayers of the godly, praying in a Church way, that he may be humbled, is a mean to humble the cast out man, nor is the man delivered to Satan morally to be hardned; but judicially and withall medicinally to be softned, that his spirit may be saved. Nor is the Church to hate him, *but to admonish him as a brother*, 2 *Thes.* 3. 15. And he is so deprived of the externall society and meanes, as the operation of the ordinances is suspended.

Erastus. *If any should die in their typicall uncleanesse, were they so Excommunicated, that their salvation was in hazard?* Cap. 2. l. 1. p. 93.

Ans. Not, so they repented: What then? *Ergo*, Excommunication was not ratified in Heaven, it followeth not.

Erastus. Beza saith, Those that were morally polluted with hainous sins, were more unclean then those who were typically only unclean: *Ergo*, They should be far rather excluded from the holy things of God.

Erastus answers, *If God had commanded them to be punished with the same punishment, and not with diverse; it would follow, that those that are morally impure, should rather be debarred then the other.*

Ans. But the Ceremoniall uncleanesse was punished so to signifie Gods detestation of morall uncleanesse, and how hatefull they were, who would multiply sacrifices, and yet *had hands full of blood*, Esa. 1. And who would *steal, murther, whore*, and yet come and stand *before God in his house, and cry, The Temple of the Lord are these*, *Ier.* 7. 4 9. And that God punished the one with heavier plagues then the other, is much for us, that adulterers far more and the uncircumcised in heart were to be holden out of the Sanctuary, as the Lord saith, *Ezech.* 44 7, 8, 9. then those who were only uncircumcised in flesh.

Erastus. *Those that morally sinned, were not debarred from the holie*

lie things, becauſe they were invited to come and offer ſacrifice for their ſins.

Anſ. And becauſe they might not enter into the Temple, while the Prieſts offered a ſacrifice for them, they were no leſſe excluded from the holy things of God, then an Excommunicated perſon is, while the *Church* ſee him ſwallowed up of grief, and do relaxe and forgive, 2 *Cor.* 2.6,7,8,9. Is this a good Argument? The Excommunicate perſon is invited to come again, that the *Church* may pardon, then it will follow he was caſt out.

Eraſtus. Paul *forbiddeth to eat with fornicators,* 1 Cor. 5. *It ſhall never follow that they are worthie of holy convention that are worthy of a common Table, and that they are unworthy of the Supper, who are unworthie of a common Table, they were debarred from a familiar Communion with the godlie:* 1. *That they might be aſhamed:* 2. *Leaſt they ſhould infect them;* Paul ſaith, *be not mixed with them* συναναμίγνυσθε, *but he ſaith not, exclude them from the Lords Table, and other holy things: In the Sacrament I muſt try my ſelf, not others; in my familiar Tabling with others, I am to try them, that I may gain them; yea,* 2 Theſ. 3. *Though we are to eſchew familiar converſing with thoſe that walk unorderly, yet are we to keep communion in holy things with them, and to admoniſh them as brethren.*

Anſ. Eraſtus propounds an Argument of his own, 1 *Cor.* 5. in place of ours; we ſaid never that they that are unworthy of the holy Supper, are unworthy to be Tabled with in common familiarity, as brethren, though that be moſt true: But we reaſon thus, Thoſe that are to be *delivered to Satan, and caſt out,* as, 1 *Cor.* 5.5,13. *of the Church,* and judged, *ver.* 12. and with *whom we may not eat,* ver. 11. Theſe are not to be admitted to the Lords Supper, which is the proper feaſt of the Church: But ſuch are all inceſtuous and ſcandalous perſons, and therefore *Paul* doth indeed command them to be excluded from the holy feaſt. 2. To ſay the Church and her Officers muſt try themſelves, not others, ere they come to the Lords Supper, is to beg the queſtion, for ere they be admitted into the Sanctuary, they are to be tried, whither they *be uncircumciſed in heart and fleſh, or not,* *Ezek.* 44.7,8,9. *Ezek.* 22.26. As we have proved. 3. *Paul* not only uſeth a paſſive verb, *be not mixed with them,* but 1 *Cor.* 5.5. he uſeth four active words, *v.* 5. παραδοῦναι Σατανᾷ, 2. *v.* 7. ἐκκάθαρατε *purge him out.* 3. *v.* 12. He willeth them κρίνειν *to judge him.* 4. He ſaith, ἐξαρεῖτε, *put away that evil one.*

Hence

Hence I argue, The men whom they convened together were to judge, to deliver to *Satan*, to purge out, to put away ἐκ μέσου out of the midst of them, *ver.* 2. or from amongst them, *v.* 13. This man they did Authoritatively either put from amongst them, as they were Christians, from their common Table, or out of their fellowship, as they were men, to kill him, Or 3. out of their Church-Communion, that they should not keep the feast of the Lords Supper with them: Let *Erastus* give a fourth: now we cannot dream of the first two: for 1. Would the Apostle command a *Church-meeting*, to interdict a man of Tabling with them in common eating and drinking? What needeth a Church-court, for they were συναχθέντες, when they did this? And what needed a judging Court for this? for, not to eat with him, was no censure of the *Church*, as *Erastus* saith. 2. It is no Grammar, nor can it bear sense, that the *Corinthians* could say, we *Corinthians* gathered together in the name and power of the *Lord Iesus*, do cast out such a one, out of the midst of us, that is, from our common-Table, this would say, they had all one common Table; and that all the Church of *Corinth* met at this time to some Feast, to cast him out of their love-Feasts; a dream no man ever conceived.

Putting out 1 *Cor.* 5. Excommunicating.

3. The Text speaketh of eating in their houses: could they cast the man out of his own house, and from his own Table? they had no power so to do. But ye will say, they might forbid any brother to go into this mans house to his Table: True, but this was not to put the man out of the midst of them, as *Paul* saith. Nor fourthly, was *Pauls* spirit, and the name and power of the *Lord Iesus* required for eschewing of a common Table with this man.

Erastus saith, *Paul commanded this*, Rom. 16.17. 2 *Thes.* 3.14, 15. *To all and every beleever at Rome, and Thessalonica by themselves.* Nor 2. were they to kill him: Never did a Church conveen to kill a man. This is so insolent that *Erastus* must give precept for it, or a practise beside the present case: therefore here must be some Church out-casting.

4. Though *Paul* will have us admonish a cast out *man as a brother*, 2 *Thes.* 3. Its private admonition that I owe to all men, *Lev.* 19.17. And that one woman is to performe to another, *Col.* 3.15. But not any of the holy things of the Sanctuary.

Erastus. *The Iews accused* Paul *of nothing, but that they lied that*

he

he brought Greeks into the Temple. The Law bad all the clean eat the Passeover, and excepteth none for their Wickednesse, Christ admitted Iudas *to the Passeover, and said, Drink ye all of this.* Paul *reciteth a Catologue of Wicked men in* Corinth, 1 *Cor.* 5. *With whom We are not to have private dealing, but he commandeth never to exclude any who are Willing to come, from the Lords Supper: We are to trie our selves, not one another, nor is it a sin to eat at the Lords Table With Wicked men.*

Ans. Belike it was a crime then to bring the *Greeks* into the Temple: 2. It is a begging of the question to say, all were admitted to the Passeover: See how this is before answered. 3. *Christ* admitted *Iudas* into the Passeover; What then? may *Timothie* lay hands suddenly on all he knows to be *Iudases*, that they come in and lap the blood of souls? contrary to 1 *Tim.* 3. Christ is above the Law, and if his practise in this were the rule, because Christ admitted *Iudas* whom he knew to be a Traitor, and did eat ordinarily at Table with him, and committed the flock to such a known wolfe. We are also to eat with covetous extortioners, which *Paul* forbiddeth, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. And we are to commit the flock of God to known Wolves, where we have a precept on the contrary, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. Christ would rather teach that we are to admit to the seals all not ignorant and scandalous, and not be too curious in striking up a window in the conscience of others: 4. *Pauls* practise at *Corinth* is but a *negative ex particulari*, and not concludent: The heathen came to hear the word at *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 23. And *Paul* doth no where command the Heathen should be excluded from the Sacraments: Will *Erastus* then have them admitted? 5. When *Paul* saith, that unworthy Communicants were guilty of the Lords body and blood, and required fidelity in the Stewards, 1 *Cor.* 4. He taketh for confessed, scandalous persons should not be admitted by the Church; its true, the sin of others who communicate unworthily, is not the sin of another fellow-communicant, who hath not authority to debar his fellow-communicant.

Lib. 1. c. 2. pag. 103. Erastus. *The Scripture debarred no Iews of old, neither from sacrifices, nor other sacraments, but commandeth that all the male children, Iews or Strangers, that were not legally unclean, nor from their homes, should thrice a year appear before the Lord in* Ierusalem, *for to partake of the holy things of God*; Ergo, *None were Excommunicated*

communicated from the holy things of God, for morall Wickednesse.

Ans. *Erastus* counteth this an Argument that cannot be Answered; but it Answers it self to me: And *Erastus* proposeth a Law that is Catholick to all the males; yet he maketh it not Catholick himself, but propoundeth a number of males that are excepted, as he excepteth those that *were legally unclean, those that are from home*: and yet, *Deut.* 16. 16. *Exod.* 23. 17. *Exod.* 34. 23. in the Letter of the Law, there is no such exception as *Erastus* maketh: I hope if he make an exception, so may we, according to the word of God.

Whether *Erastus* doth prove that none were excluded amongst the Iewes from the Sacraments for Morall uncleanesse.

Though we should give, but not grant, that there was no Excommunication amongst the Iews, but only for Ceremoniall uncleanesse; yet it proveth not, there is no Excommunication in the Christian Church, but the contrary; for if for touching the dead by Gods Law, men were separated from the holy things; in that Church, far more, for Morall uncleanesse, are men to be separated from the holy things of God under the New Testament, for undeniably Ceremoniall separation signified and typed out Morall separation, *Col.* 2. 21. 2. What ground *Erastus* hath to except those that were Ceremonially unclean, and so as uncircumcised in flesh, that they were not to appeare before the Lord, (let him shew the Letter of Scripture for it,) the same ground have we to shew that the uncircumcised in heart are not to appeare before the Lord, *Ezek.* 44. 7, 8, 9. *Ezek.* 22. 26. Nor shall I thinke God would both command all the male without exception, to compeare before him thrice a yeare, whether they were Adulterers, Theeves, Murtherers, Idolaters, or not such: but truly sanctified and holy; and that he would expresly rebuke the Males that were Adulterers, Theeves, Murtherers, Idolaters, because they compeared for him in his House, *Ier.* 7. 8, 9, 10. So then as he commandeth the the Males to compeare, except they be legally uncleane, or Lepers, and would rebuke them, if they should appeare before him being Ceremonially unclean; and therefore in that case God would have them not to come. So also, if they should be Morally unclean, he would have them not to come, that is, it is not their sin, that they appeare before the Lord, *quoad substantiam actus*, but their obedience, but it is their sinne that they appeare *tali modo*, in their unrepented guiltinesse, yet is it the sinne of the Priests in not differencing

rencing betweene the cleane and the uncleane, that they ſuffer them to come *tali modo*, that as Swine they pollute the holy things of God, to the Male it is their ſinne, that they come ſo, and ſo guilty; and that they come not, it is their ſinne, but to the Prieſts it is their ſinne, that they admit the uncleane, and caſt Pearles to Dogs. But as God would not rebuke unworthy Eaters at the Lords Table, 1 *Cor.* 11. if they might eate unworthily by Gods Law, ſo neither would he rebuke Theeves and Murtherers for appearing before him in his Temple, if they ought not, by Law, not to appeare in that ſtate. *No doubt* (ſaith *Eraſtus*) pag. 106. *there were many Wicked perſons in the time of* Ioſhua, Iudges, *and the* Kings, *in ſuch a multitude, yet they were bidden all to compeare before the Lord, and none are excepted for their wickedneſſe, and it is certaine God would not both bid them compeare and not compeare.*

Anſ. All that ſinned in Iſrael were bidden offer Sacrifice, yet thoſe who are wicked, as *Sodom*, are expreſly debarred from Sacrifices, except they were morally clean, *Eſai.* 1. 13. *Bring me no more vaine oblation, incenſe is an abomination unto me,---* 16 *Waſh you, make you cleane.* So ſay I here, God ſaid expreſly, *Ier.* 7. 9, 10. *Except you be waſhed from your lying, ſtealing, come not before me to ſtand in my houſe, to prophane my holy Name. Ergo,* the Morally unclean are excommunicated from thoſe holy things, ſo all the wicked by the ſame reaſon were forbidden, they remaining in their wickednes, without Repentance, to eate the Paſſeover, yea, to take the Name of God in their mouth, *Pſal.* 50. 16, 17. to Sacrifice, *Eſai.* 66. 3. to touch the Altar of God, except their hands were waſhed in innocency, *Pſal.* 26. 6. And the Prieſts had the charge of the houſe of God, to put difference betweene the cleane, and the uncleane, and the Prieſts are ſaid to violate the holy things of God, if the wicked as well as the Ceremonially unclean were not debarred, *Hag.* 2. 11, 12. *Ezek.* 22. 25, 26. *Ezek.* 44. 7, 8, 9. and certainly, the Males that were Leapers were expreſly excepted, and forbidden to come in the Congregation of Gods people, as is before proved.

Eraſtus. *The Phariſees and Sadducees debarred none from the Sacraments for their Wicked life.*

Anſ. What? will *Eraſtus* make the *Phariſees* practiſe our Rule, they killed the Lord of Glory, and then eat the Paſſeover with bloody

bloody hearts and hands: Is such a Practise our Rule?

Erastus. Iohn Baptist *refused Baptisme to none willing to bee baptized, and referred the inward Baptisme, by the Spirit and fire to Iesus Christ.*

Ans. Iohn baptized those who confessed their sinnes, and professed their Repentance; and the like we crave of those that are admitted to the other Sacrament. And the instance of *Iohn* or an *Apostles* baptizing, cannot warrant the Baptizing of all Murtherers, Idolatrous persons, or the wickedst living, as *Erastus* saith, and the vildest on earth, if they should but desire Baptisme, and give no confession of their Faith, nor profession of their Repentance.

Erastus. *Christ who rebuked many abuses, and cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, would have rebuked the pollution of the Sacraments also; but that he never did: and Christ said that* Peter *should forgive his offending Brother often in one day, if he but say, It repenteth me: and he saith, This transaction shall be ratified in heaven. Will you be more cruell then God? Do not we often lie to God in our Confession to God? He meaneth well, who desires to come to the Supper: Be not Iudges of mens Conscience.*

Ans. Christ Commanding not to cast Pearls to Swine, and scourging out those that polluted that Temple that was a type of his body, doth Argue clearly, that the holy things of God should not be prophaned: But that Christ rebuked all abuses in the worship of God, in particular, *Erastus* cannot say. 2. It is one thing to forgive our brother, by putting away private grudge, and a church-pardoning in the name of *Christ* is another; in the former sense we are to forgive our enemy, though he repent not, *Mat.* 6.12.14,15. *Rom.* 12. 19,20. *Luk.* 23. 34. But this forgiveness, *Luk.* 17. is not said to be ratified in heaven; for God doth not alway forgive when we forgive, God doth forgive when the sinner repenteth. *Erastus* will have a lying confession ratified in Heaven. 3. When the Church in Christs Name forgiveth not upon words and lies; but upon Visible Testimonies of repentance, they are no more Iudges of the heart, then *Isaiah* when he said, *Except ye believe, ye shall not be established:* and *Paul* when he said to the Jaylor, *Believe and thou shalt be saved:* for without more then lying words of mouth, yea, without true lively faith; neither could the one be established, nor the other saved.

A twofold forgiveness.

Pag. 117. Erastus. *When* Paul *dehorteth the Corinthians to eat things Sacrificed to Idols, in the Idols Temple, because they could not be partakers of the Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Devils; he bids them not forsake the Supper of the Lord, but only not to go to the Feast of Idols; because the Supper, and these Tables of Devils are inconsistent; therefore he saith, I will not have you to have fellowship with Devils; but he saith not, I will not have you to come to the Supper of the Lord; nor doth he bid them approve their repentance ere they come to some (I know not what) Presbyters. And in this place he speaketh of an externall Communion, as the purpose and words prove; because he speaketh of Israel according to the flesh. 3. Because those that eat things Sacrificed to Idols, were perswaded there was no difference between those meats, and other meats.*

Anf. Erastus his Argument is this, being reduced to form; is, if *Paul* say not, 1 *Cor.* 10. I will not have you come to the Lords Supper; but only, I will not have you to have fellowship with the Devil in his Table; then he will have none debarred by the Elders from the Lords Supper: But the latter is true. I deny the Proposition, it is a connexion, that one who taketh on him to refute such a precious and eminent divine as *Theod. Beza*, may be ashamed of; and yet his book from head to foot standeth most upon a negative Argument from some particular place of Scripture; for he speaketh nothing of the power of *Elders*, to keep the holy things of God pure.

What if he should say, *Moses in the first of Genesis saith not, I will not have you not to come to the Lords Supper*; Ergo, *there is no authoritative debarring of men from the Lords Supper*: Such sandy consequences no learned Divines would ever dream of: 2. *Beza*, nor any of our Divines never dreamed that God in the Old or New Testament said, *Nolo vos ad mensam domini (ad sacramenta) venire*, which are the words of *Erastus*; so his conclusion cometh not near the controversie: Iews and Gentiles are invited, and commanded to come to *Christ*, and so to all the Ordinances and Sacraments, but I hope this will not infer that all should come to the Sacraments hand over head, and whether they be clean or unclean, circumcised or Baptized, or not circumcised, not Baptized. God commanded *Aarons* sons to serve in the sanctuary, and appear before him in their charge: What, *Ergo*, it is not Gods will, that they

All are invited to the Sacraments, but not that they come any way they please.

they come not to the Sanctuary, and before him unwashed, and with strange fire, and without their holy garments? this is the very consequence of *Erastus*: Our question I conceive is, whither all must be admitted promiscuously, and whether even those that come immediatly from the Devils Table, without any preparation known to the Church, should be set at Christs elbow to eat the Lords body and blood? *Erastus* saith, *Paul* never said, *Nolo vos ad mensam domini venire*; then because two negatives make one affirmative, *Paul* must say, I *will that all that are partakers of the table of the Devil, come and be partakers of the Lords body*: But the conclusion is contradicent to *Erastus* himself, who saith right down: *I judge, that he, who will but trample the Sacraments, should not be admitted unto them*, and to *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 27, &c. 3. *Erastus* confoundeth two Questions; one is, whither all should be admitted to the Lords Supper: (*Erastus* saith, every where in his book none are to be debarred;) & another by whom are they to be admitted or debarred? By the civill Magistrates, saith *Erastus*; by the Stewards and Officers of the house of God, the rest of the Church consenting, say we. 4. The Argument will conclude, that not onely the Church or Magistrate ought to admit those that have fellowship with the Devil to the Table of Christ, but they ought to command them to come, it being Christs will they should be admitted, and that they themselves who are Communicants are obliged, though keeping fellowship with the Devil, to come, and eat their own damnation: for *Paul* saith, by this reason in the place, 1 *Cor.* 10. No more (I *will not have the partakers of the Devils table, to come to the Lords table*) nor he saith, (I *will not have the Elders to debar them*) if *Erastus* say, they should try and examine themselves and come: He flees from the controversie, which is not, whether the worthy, but whether the scandalous and unworthy should come; *Erastus* saith, all should come. 5. Whereas *Erastus* will have the Apostle to speak of the externall Communion of the Elements onely: 1. It is false. 2. Nothing to the purpose, it is false, 1. *ver.* 16. It is called the *Communion of the body and blood of Christ*, and that must be more then externall Communion. 2. *ver.* 17. *We many are one body*; this is not an externall body only, for it is the unity of the body of Christ signified by one bread. 3. It is not externall only, but internall and spiritual fellowship with Devils that is condemned, *ver.* 20. 21. *Ergo*,

The question whether all should be admitted to the Lords Supper perverted by *Erastus*. Cap. 3. l. 1. p. 117. Lib. 3. c. 3. pag. 207. *Et si quis talis (qui calcabit sacramenta) reperiatur hunc ego numine admittendum censeo.*

It must be internall Communion with Christ in his death that is sealed and commanded. 4. This is meer *Socinianisme*, to have the Sacraments only memorative signes, as is clear. 2. It is not to a purpose, for if the Church debar only from externall society, from the Church and externall Seals; this debarring being ratified in Heaven, *Matth.* 18. It is sufficient for our conclusion. 5. *Paul* his condemning of eating at the Idols Table, as inconsistent with eating and drinking of the Lords body, he must expressly forbid those who eateth in the Idoll-Temple, to come to the Lords Table, except they repent, and try themselves: Hence it must follow, that if Christ have commanded his *Stewards*, to dispense the word of promise and threatnings, and comforts, according to the temper of the flock, so must they dispense the Seals, and so by good consequence *Paul* said (*I will not have the Lord and Satan mingled, nor a partaker of Satans Table admitted to the Lords Table*) ὁπερ δεῖ δεῖξαι;

Pag. 118. *Erastus* his Arg. 13. 1. *Cor.* 10. *God spared not idolaters and murmurers; yet they eat, we, and they of the same spirituall meat, and drinke the same spirituall drinke, and so had the same Sacraments (otherwise the Argument of the Apostle were nothing; if ours and their Sacraments were not all one) if then, those that were idolators, fornicators, were admitted to their Sacraments, then also to ours under the New Testament.*

Ans. Beza answereth well to that. *Manna* and the water out of the Rock, as they had a spirituall Relation to Christ, were holy things and types of Christ, just as our Sacraments are signes of Christ already come in the flesh, and so agreed in the kinde of holy signes with our Sacraments: yet *Manna*, and the water out of the Rock, were also ordained to be bodily food, for the famishing and thirsty people, good or bad, holy or unholy, these two, *Manna* and *water* out of the Rock were given by the Commandment of God and the Priests, to the people, both as Gods people in Covenant with God, and to them, as men starving in the wilderness, and dying for thirst; for they had not plowing, earing, harvest, bread, vineyards, wine, fountains in the wilderness, and therefore no marvell then such holy things being; also beside that they were holy things, such as were necessary to keep them from starving and bodily death, as the shewbread, which was also a type of the word of life revealed to the Ministers of God, was given

given to keep *David* and his men from ſtarving: No marvell (I ſay) then theſe bodily helps (though in another higher ſignification they were Sacramentalls) were by Gods command beſtowed on many wicked men, who often partake both of outward Ordinances and temporall deliverance from death and famiſhing, becauſe they are mixt with the people of God. But *Eraſtus*, if he would prove any thing againſt us, ſhould have proved that circumciſion, the Paſſe-over, and other holy things of God, ordained for the viſible Saints to ſhew forth our ſpirituall Communion with Chriſt, and which were never ordained for neceſſary helps to ſuſtain the naturall life, were to be adminiſtred to thoſe that were openly prophane and wicked; and therefore we deny this connexion: *Manna* ſignified the very ſame thing; to wit, Chriſt our food of life, which bread and wine ſignifies; *Ergo*, As *Manna* was given both as a holy ſigne to figure out Chriſt our life, and to feed the bodies of openly holy, or openly prophane, to ſuſtain their bodily life, ſo alſo baptiſme and the Lords Supper, which ſerve for no bodily uſe, ſhould be adminiſtred to thoſe that are openly prophane.

Eraſtus is put to a poor ſhift with this ſolid Anſwer of that Reverend, Learned, and holy Divine, *Theod. Beza*, he ſaith, *Vis dicam quod ſentio? Tui ubique ſimiliſes: The ſea and the cloud*, ſaith he, *were not neceſſary to feed the body.*

Two ſorts of ſignes, ſome purely holy ſome partly holy, partly neceſſary for the bodily life.

It is true, *Eraſtus* the Phyſician would think the cloud and pillar of fire can neither be Phyſick for the ſick, nor food for the whole; yet Phyſitians ſay, *Manna* is apt for both; nor is the dvided Red-Sea, food or Phyſick: But good man, he knowes the cloud was their guide and convey by night and day through the wilderneſſe, and appointed by God to convey the Leapers, the unclean, and all thoſe who were Excommunicated from the holy things, and the Idolators and openly wicked, as well as the clean and the holy, and he knew the time that the people had no food but *Manna* a holy ſigne, that thoſe who were unclean ſeven dayes, and often many times longer, were not to ſtarve for hunger, but muſt eat *Manna* though a holy, yet their only neceſſary food then, without which they could not live.

But I hope *Eraſtus* cannot prove, while they were unclean, or put out of the Camp, or yet extreamly wicked, that they might eat the Paſſeover, which was a meer holy Sacrament, not ordained for

for the feeding of the body, as *Manna* and water out of the Rock were.

Eraſtus may know the dividing of the Sea, was neceſſary to preſerve the life of the moſt wicked and unclean (God being pleaſed for his Churches cauſe, to beſtow Temporall deliverances on wicked men, mingled with the godly) from being drowned with the Egyptians, and that God, who *will have mercy, and not ſacrifice*, may well by a poſitive Law appoint that holy and unholy, clean and unclean, ſhall have the uſe of ſuch holy things, as are not meerly holy, but mixt, being both means of Divine inſtitution, and alſo neceſſary Subſidies for mans life, but it followeth not therefore holy things, that are purely holy, ſhould be proſtitute to holy and unholy, the clean and unclean.

Pag. 120. Eraſtus. *God in the Church of the Jews puniſhed wicked men with bodily puniſhments, not with Excluſion from the Sacraments, and* Paul *threatneth death and ſickneſſe, not Excommunication to thoſe that did eat and drink unworthily.*

Anſ. Then putting out of the Campe was no Excluſion from the holy things of God, all the world not onely will cry ſhame on this Divinity: But they will ſay, *Eraſtus*, his Logick is bad. God puniſheth ſome wicked men with death, and the ſword of the Magiſtrate, and ſtoning; *Ergo*, he appointed no Eccleſiaſticall debarring of the unclean from Circumciſion: 2. It is falſe that *Paul* threatneth death to unworthy Communicants; only he ſaith, God ſlew many of them for that ſin; and hence it follows well, the Officers ſhould hinder the ſcandalous to ruſh into ſuch a ſin, as is the not diſcerning the Lords body, which bringeth death and diſeaſes on the actors: What conſequence is this? *God* puniſheth wicked men; *Ergo*, the Officers ſhould not rebuke them for thoſe ſins, nor the Magiſtrate or Church puniſh wicked men: God puniſheth ſtubborn Rebels to parents; *Ergo*, the judge ſhould not ſtone them, the contrary Logick is the arguing of the Spirit of God.

P. 120, 121. Eraſtus. *Every one is to try himſelf, therefore there is no need of any other to try him, for* Paul *ſpeaketh of that which is proper to every mans conſcience.*

Anſ. It is an unlearned and vain conſequence: It is commanded, that every one try if he be in the Faith or no; for the peace of his conſcience, and this is ſo proper to a man himſelf, and ſo perſonall, that

that no man can try, or know certainly, whether he be in the state of grace, but he himself, 2 *Cor.* 13.5. *Rev.* 2.17. None can joyn with him in this, as none can joyn with a man to try if he have faith to discern the Lords body, and eat worthily, but will it follow therefore the Pastor should not watch over him to try in another way in a Pastorall way, by his walking, profession, and practicall knowledge, whether he be in Christ or no.

The contrary is *Heb.* 13.17. *They watch for the souls of the people, as they that must give an accompt.* And they are so far to try that are Shepherds, that they are obliged in a Pastorall way, to know those of the flock that are diseased, *Ezech.* 34.4. *Sick, broken, driven away, and lost.* And to what end should they try themselves, least they eat damnation to themselves? *Ergo,* the *Stewards* should try the stomacks, that they eat not poyson: If then, the Lords Law bid men beware they be not tempted to Sorcery, Sodomy, Murthers; and if every man ought to have personall watchfulnesse over his own conscience, that he be not insnared to those sins; and *Achan* was to try if his heart was ingaged to the wedge of Gold, and to be wary to meddle with it, but it doth not follow that Magistrates, as *Joshua* should not try out Sorcerers, Sodomites, and other *Achans* to punish them.

Erastus, 2 *Cor.* 13. *is against this*; a person is to try himselfe: Will it follow when he hath tryed himselfe, that he cannot come to the Lords Supper, except he seem meet to the Elders. And this not our consequence, let *Erastus* owne it, we care not; In a constitute Church he should, else *Erastus* provides no way against a Pagan, who hath heard the Word, as he may doe, 1 *Cor.* 14. 23. may without the Elders and Church sit downe at the Lords Supper, for *Erastus* provides no stop for him, but only his own pagan Conscience, and so may one by that rule but trample on the Sacrament, his owne Conscience is all his rule, contrary to what he saith himselfe, *lib.* 3. *c.* 3. *p.* 207.

Erastus 1 Cor. 11. Paul *forbiddeth none to come to the Supper, but upon supposition that they come as the manner is, he biddeth them come worthily, as all are bidden hear the Word, though they be forbidden to heare it, as if it were some prophane History; nor doth the Lord command sinfull coming, for no act commanded of God is evill.*

Ans. 1.

All are commanded to hear the Word, but not to come to the Supper.

Anſ. 1. *Paul* then forbiddeth not Pagans, more to come to the Supper, and Children, then he forbiddeth them to heare the Word, which is abſurd; he commandeth all to heare, but he commandeth not all to come to the Supper, but thoſe onely *that can diſcerne the Lords body*, for to heare the Word, though I be not prepared, is ſimply neceſſary, if I would be ſaved; and to ſacrifice, if I would be reconciled; and to pray, if I would obtaine any bleſſing; though the manner of doing all theſe be commanded, that I heare, ſacrifice, and pray in faith. But to come to the Supper is not commanded to all, not to Pagans, not to children, not to the unregenerated; but onely to the regenerated, and to thoſe who diſcerne the Lords body: and for a child to come to the Lords Supper, or an unrenewed man, is forbidden, not commanded, and no ill act is commanded, and it is a ſinne that they come at all: But *Eraſtus* will have it lawfull as it is to heare the Word, then doth Chriſt command Turks and children to come to the Supper, for he commandeth them to heare the Word, and *Peter* bade *Simon Magus* pray, *Act.* 8. 22. but he neither bids give the Supper to him, nor bids he him receive it, but by the contrary, forbids *pearles to be caſt unto Swine.*

Arg. 16. Page 124. *Eraſtus* Arg. 16. *God will not have fewer Chriſtians to be members of the Church now, then of Iewes to be members of the Iewiſh Church. But God would have all circumciſed, even the moſt flagitious, that were puniſhed by the Magiſtrate, to be members of the Iewes Church*, Ergo, *God will have all the baptized to be Members of the Church.*

Anſ. This will prove, that all baptized, even children, ſhould come to the Supper. 2. I deny the *Minor*, to wit, that all the moſt wicked remained Members of the viſible Iewiſh Church, *jure* before God, the wicked Jewes to God, were as *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, *Eſa.* 1. 10. Yea he ſaith, *Amos* 9. 7. *Are ye not unto me as children of Ethiopians, O children of Iſrael, ſaith the Lord?* What they were *de facto*, and not caſt out, was the fault of the Prieſts, and that the Church does tollerate Iezabels, Wolves, Lions in the flock, and admitteth them to holy things, is their ſin.

Page 124. Eraſtus. *But Repentance was not alwaies commanded to thoſe Iewes eſpecially who were unclean, by touching an unclean thing againſt their will and ignorantly, and the purging of them depended on*

their

their owne will, so they observed the Ceremonies of Moses.

Answ. That is much for us, if those who were uncleane, against their will, and cast out of the campe, it being a trying Type, that far more those that are wickedly scandalous are to be cast out of the Church.

Erastus. *The Church is a draw-net, a field, a marriage Supper, there be good and ill in it, and it was not the sinne of the inviters, who are bidden invite all good and bad,* Mat. 22. *But the man that came himselfe, without the wedding garment, he is cast into utter darkenesse*: Ergo, *The Officers are to invite all, and forbid none.*

Answ. They are to invite all, to all Ordinances, and Seals, *even Dogs and Swine*, that is false: They are to invite all to some Ordinances; to heare the Law and Gospel preached, but not the Seales, that were to cast Pearles to Swine. 2. The way of *Erastus* is, that none are to be debarred, nor to debarre themselves from the Seales, more then from the Word.

The Lords forbidding *Adam* to touch the tree of Life, and his casting of him out of Paradise, and *Cains* being cast out from the presence of the Lord, to me are rather Types presignifying Excommunication, and that God will have wicked men debarred from holy things, then patternes of Excommunications, and so are they alledged by *Beza* and our Divines.

CHAP. VII. Quest. 3.

Whether Erastus *doth justly deny that Excommunication was typified in the Old Testament?*

WEe take types of uncleanesse in the Old Testament, to be rightly expounded, when the holy Ghost in the New-[Testa]ment doth expound them. Now that Ceremoniall uncleannes[se] typifie Morall uncleanesse is cleare, 2 *Cor.* 7. 17. *Touch no unclean thing, and* I *will receive you,* 18. *And* I *will be a Father to you, and yee shall be my Sonnes and Daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.* This is a manifest Exposition of the Ceremoniall holinesse and cleanneſſe, commanded in the booke of *Leviticus*, for

after the Lord hath given them a number of Lawes, about eschewing of uncleane things, he saith in generall, *Lev.* 26. 3. *If ye walke in my Statutes, and keepe my Commandements, and doe them.* 11. *I will set my Tabernacle amongst you, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* And it is a cleare alluſion to *Numb.* 19. 11. *He that toucheth the dead body of any man, shall be unclean seven dayes.* 16. *He that toucheth one that is slaine with the sword, in the open field, is uncleane.* 22. *Whatsoever the uncleane person toucheth shall be uncleane*: So *Paul*, Tit. 1. 15. *To them that are defiled and unbeleeving, nothing is pure, but even their minde and conscience is defiled.*

2. The Prophets expound it so, *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and yee shall be clean. From all your filthinesse, and all your Idols will I cleanse you.* Hath he not a cleare reference to the water of Separation, *Num.* 19.? With this water the unclean person, and his clothes were washed, yea, the Tents and the Vessels, ver. 17, 21. According to which, saith *Paul*, 2 Cor. 7. 1. *Having therefore these promises (dearly beloved,) let us cleanse our selves, from all filthinesse of the flesh and spirit*: Here a cleare Alluſion to Ceremoniall filthines bodily, and of the flesh, and of Tents and Vessels, *Heb.* 10. 22. *To both these washings there is a reference. Let us draw neere, having our hearts sprinkled from an evill conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.* And *Heb.* 9. 13. *If the blood of buls and goates, and the ashes of an heifer* (mingled with running water, *Num.* 19. 17. which purged vessels that were but capable of Ceremoniall uncleanneſse) *sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh.* 14. *How much more shall the bloud of Christ, ---purge your conscience from dead works?* It is cleare also, that the unclean were separated and the Leper put out of the campe, so as the children of *Israel* might not touch any thing Ceremonially unclean, and all uncleane persons were put out of the Congregation. Hence the Hypocrites word alluding to that separation, *Esa.* 64. 5. *Stand by thy selfe, come not neere to me; for I am holier then thou.* So was *Miriam* removed, and leprous King *Vzziah* out of the Congregation of the Lord.

Confirm. Thes. l. 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 130, 131.

Erastus. *We deny that the Ceremoniall uncleannes, signified the wickednes of conversation, so that it can be proved that both these uncleannesses were punished with the same punishment.* 1. *Because ma-*

ny

ny against their Will were polluted legally, as the night pollutions, the diseases monethly of Women, when they were necessitated to be with Children, Parents, Wife, brethren when they died; sometimes they touched unclean things ignorantly, but no man lives wickedly against his Will. 2. God could not forbid in every time and place the touching of the dead, onely God commanded the polluted to be purified according to the Law: God would have his people neere their dying friends, but God never gave leave to any to live wickedly. 3. A holy man not sinning in his thought, remaining holy, might be legally unclean, without either his will or knowledge, by touching some uncleane thing, that he knew not to be unclean. But a wicked man doth not at one time both doe wickedly, and remaine pure and holy.

Anſ. All this is a meere cavilling at the wiſedome of *God*, in making ſuch Ceremoniall lawes, and ſuch puniſhments againſt the tranſgreſſors of them, as the wiſe Law-giver of his free-will thought fit, becauſe theſe Lawes ſeeme ridiculous. But *the fooliſhnes of God is wiſer then men.* 1. We ſay not, that the puniſhment of legall and morall uncleanneſſe is all one every way, and alwayes; it is enough for our purpoſe that God will have thoſe who are legally uncleane ſeparated from holy things, while they bee purified, and little ſinne and guiltineſſe ſeeme to bee in legall uncleanneſſe, as when bodily Leproſie came on perſons againſt their will, yet when God will have them puniſhed with being removed from the people of God, from the Sanctuary and the holy things, this could not be for it ſelfe; for as *Paul* ſaith, *Doth God take care of Oxen?* So we, doth God hate bodily diſeaſes, which are his owne juſt actions, not our ſinfull doings? ſince I ſay God hateth them not, and putteth not puniſhment on them for themſelves; therefore it muſt be to ſignifie what deteſtation and puniſhment the *Lord our God*, would have his Church to put upon morall wickedneſſe: So we thinke *Eraſtus* might have ſpared paper and paines, in proving a difference (which no Divine denieth,) between Ceremoniall and Morall uncleanneſſe, and the puniſhment of the one and of the other, for it can never prove his concluſion. *Ergo*, Separation for legall uncleanneſſe, cannot typifie ſeparation for Morall uncleanneſſe. I could give eight and twenty differences between *Iſaac* and Chriſt, as

Eraſtus giveth ſeventeen or eighteen between Legall and Morall uncleanneſſe, and the puniſhment of both: But I hope that ſhould never conclude againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *Heb.* 11. 17, 18, 19. *Gal.* 4. 28, 29, 30. *Rom.* 9. 9. that *Iſaac* was not a type of Ieſus Chriſt. 2. Night pollutions are not altogether againſt our will, they are ſinfull pollutions, except concupiſcence, and luſtfull habituall day luſts, the cauſe of them, be not ſinfull pollutions; yea, and forbidden in the ſeventh Commandement.

3. Theſe pollutions Legall cauſed by invincible ignorance, were types or ſymbolicall ſignes of our originall iniquity, and give me leave to doubt, if all actuall touching of things unclean, was no Morall ſinfulneſſe. I conceive the *Iewes*, as the Chriſtians alſo were obliged to walk ἀκριβῶς, *Epheſ.* 5. 15. and were to take heed to the outer-man, that they ſhould *come neere no uncleane thing*, in ſome caſes leproſie and other legall uncleannes came on them without either will or knowledge. 4. If the ſtanding beſide the dying friends be all one with touching the dead, I remit to the principles of Phyſicke, and if the touching of any dead be excepted in the Law Ceremoniall, let the learned judge. All the other differences aſſigned by *Eraſtus* I leave, as not concludent againſt us, they tend all either to blame God, who ſhould puniſh ſome legall uncleannes, that is, altogether againſt the will of man, with any puniſhment at all, as the three firſt differences inſinuate. Or, 2. that God puniſhed ſome Legall uncleannes more ſeverely then homicide and Morall uncleannes, as the 5. difference doth inſinuate, and the 4. difference. And this is to challenge God, to whom I deſire to aſcribe a Soveraignty, both in puniſhing, or pardoning as he thinketh good: Or in puniſhing more ſeverely, or more mildely theſe ſame ſinnes, or in puniſhing greater ſins with lighter puniſhment, and with a heavier rod lighter ſinnes.

133. Eraſtus. *Any legally unclean Was debarred from the Temple, the difference Was onely in the time, but you debarre not all Wicked men from the Supper.*

Anſ. The moſt that were legally unclean, were alſo morally unclean, in that they willingly tranſgreſſed a known Law; *Ergo*, Legall uncleannes, was alſo Morall uncleannes. 2. Though we debar not all wicked men, but onely the ſcandalous, yet we have in readineſſe vengeance againſt all, and ſo againſt latent diſobedience, which

which is a high censure, in debarring hypocrites from heaven; and we conceive Legall uncleannes as the monthly diseases of women, night pollutions, want of Circumcision did typifie much naturall and originall heart corruption, which cannot be punished by men or the Church; but it followes not, becaus Legall uncleanneſſe ſignifieth ſome other uncleanneſſe then that which is ſcandalous and cenſurable by the Church; *Ergo*, it ſignifieth not ſinnes ſcandalous and cenſurable by the Church.

Eraſtus. *He that was legally unclean a long time, or all his life, as a Leper; was not eſteemed as no Iew, or uncircumciſed, or a damned man, he was to keepe the Sabbath; yea, none unclean were excluded from the Sacrament of the generall expiation in the* 10. *Moneth, Lev.* 16. and 23. *Yea, every ſoul under the pain of cutting off, was to afflict his ſoule that day: then the Lepers were not as Heathen and Publicans and condemned men, yea the Magiſtrate could not puniſh a man for Leproſie.* 134.

Anſ. This is a poor argument, becauſe Ceremoniall Excommunication differeth from Chriſtian Excommunication; *Ergo*, the former is not a type of the latter, it followeth not. *Iſaacs* blood was never really ſhed, Chriſt was really crucified, *Iſaac* was not mocked, ſpitted on, did not wear a crown of Thornes, Iews and Gentiles crucified him not, between two Theevs. *Ergo*, *Iſaac* was no figure of Chriſt offered for our ſins, it followeth not. 2. Nor are Lepers no *Iews*, but in ſome reſpect, they might no more come to the Temple. 2. Nor amongſt the people of God, nor 3. Eate the Paſſeover, then Heathens might doe; and ſo are the Excommunicated with us, they are not exempted from faith, repenting, afflicting their ſoule for the ſinnes of the Land, nor are they eternally damned, ſo they repent. But *Eraſtus* hath no ground to ſay, becauſe the *unclean were to afflict their ſoules, and abſtaine from ſervile worke in the day of atonement*, (as our Excommunicants are not looſed from the duties of the ten Commandements wholly, but from ſome publike Church duties) but I ſee not how it followes; *Ergo*, *The uncleane were to come to the holy convocation in the day of expiation, and to obſerve the publike ſolemnities with Gods people*; One Law of God is not contradicent to another, and the Leper and unclean were ſeparated, *Ergo*, God could not tie them to be mingled with his people. 3. The Leper was not puniſhed by the *Magiſtrate*, for he ſuffered onely for his

his Leproſie. But it followeth not that the *Magiſtrate* ſhould not puniſh a perſon obſtinate to the Church.

136. Eraſtus. *When ſome uncleane perſons were debarred from the Tabernacle and ſacrifices, many wicked men were admitted*: Ergo, *Moſes both commanded men, at the ſame time, to come to the holy things, and not to come.*

Anſw. *Moſes* bade the unclean come, he bade all clean, ſo they were not ſcandalouſly and openly wicked, come; and ſome came that were not bidden, but rebuked for their coming, as *Ier.* 7. 8. 9. *Pſal.* 50. 15. Here is no contradiction.

Eraſtus. *There be no figures of things preſent, but of things to come; morall uncleanneſſe was preſent, at leaſt there be no figures of things that incurre in the ſenſes, as theft and homicide.*

Anſ. Circumciſion, the Lords Supper, are ſignes and Symbols of things preſent, as of Originall ſinne, our preſent union with Chriſt, and communion of love amongſt our ſelves, *Col.* 2. 11. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17, 18. 2. Scandals, as they are ſpirituall wickedneſs, incurre not in our ſenſes, yet other wayes they are viſible. 3. Chriſts dying was both tyipfied to *Iohn* the Apoſtle, and *Mary*, and his death incurred in their ſenſes, they ſaw him die. So was Chriſt raiſed from the dead, typified by *Ionas* in the belly of the Whale, and with their eyes they ſaw him, after he roſe againe.

137. Eraſtus. *Houſes, cloaths, trees, ſtones, were capable of legall uncleannes, men onely of Morall; Legall uncleannes is a qualitie, wickednes morall is in actions.*

Anſ. I am aſhamed and wearied to put in Paper ſuch childiſh things, all this will not prove that Legall uncleannes is no type of Morall uncleannes; *Iſaac* was but a man, *Moſes* a man onely; *Ergo*, they cannot be Types of Chriſt who is more then a man; Bread and Wine are ſome other thing then Chriſt, then cannot theſe be ſymbols of Chriſt, and our ſpirituall communion with him. I ſee nothing here, but a challenging of Gods wiſedome, who hath choſen leproſie bodily, to figure out ſinnes ſpirituall Leproſie. *Eraſtus* will ſay not ſo, Leproſie is in the category of quality, and ſinfull actions in the category of actions.

Eraſtus. *Legall uncleannes, ſignifieth naturall corruption, not ſcandals.*

Anſ. Yea but Leproſie and other uncleannes legall, was contagious and infectious, and did relate to wicked actions that infect

as a canker; sin originall being common to all, is not that contagious from one to many; nor did the Lord ever command Separation for sinne Originall, but for transgression of Ceremoniall Lawes he did.

Erastus. *The Ceremoniall uncleannes does typifie the justification, and washing of a sinner in Christs blood, because no unclean thing can enter in the New Ierusalem, and so the Scripture,* Rev. 21. Esa. 42. Ioel 3. Acts 15. *And it shadowes out no such thing as Excommunication out of the Church.*

Ans. All the arguments that *Erastus* made to prove that legall separation and uncleannes, proveth not Excommunication and Morall uncleannes, will with the same force conclude, that Legall uncleannes is not that which excludes men out of heaven, As for instance; to begin with the last, Legall uncleanneſse signifieth sinne originall, not wicked actions, therefore it signifieth not scandals, then by this Legall uncleannes that caused legall separation, is signified mens exclusion out of the *high Ierusalem*, for onely sinne Originall, not for actuall sins. This type must be a lying type, for actuall sins especially debarres us out of the *New Ierusalem*, *Rev.* 21. 8. *c.* 22. 15. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9. 2. Legall uncleannes and corruption of nature, differ as much as legall uncleannes and actuall wickedneſse. But *Erastus* said the former cannot typifie the latter. 1. Because Legall uncleannes is often involuntary, 2. It is not universally forbidden. 3. Many godly men may be legally unclean, but actuall morall wickedneſse is not so, even so say I. 1. All naturall or originall uncleannes is voluntary in *Adam*. 2. Is universally forbidden. 3. It cannot consist with that holines which we must have, or we cannot see God. 3. By *Erastus* his fourth difference, legall uncleannes was otherwise punished then naturall corruption, for naturall corruption is punished with the first and second death, *Ephes.* 2. 2. *Rom.* 5. 15, 16. the like may be said of all the rest. 4. *Numb.* 12. 14. Shame was unseparably annexed to Leprosie with contagion, so leavening of others, and shame is annexed to foul scandals, and annexed to casting out of the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5, 6, 7. 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. *Gal.* 5. 9, 10. But though a neceſsity of washing may be holden forth to us in Legall uncleannes, ere we enter into Heaven; yet not so directly as in legall separation, for in it men scandalous are excluded out of the church, least the uncleane

Ceremoniall uncleannes typified Exclusion out of the visible Church for Scandals, not out of the Kingdome of Heaven.

cleane ſhould infect the clean, as is cleare as the light, *Num.* 19.22. *Hag.* 2.13. *Gal.* 5.9.10. 1 *Cor.* 5.6,7. but wicked men are not excluded out of the *New Ieruſalem* in heaven, for fear they ſhould infect and defile any perſon in heaven. 2. Separation from the Church is medicinall, *Num.* 12.14. that the party may be humbled and pardoned, 2 *Cor.* 5, 6, 7. that the Spirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. and the man ſhamed for his further good, 2 *Theſ.* 3. 14. But excluſion of men out of the *New Jeruſalem* for their uncleannes, *Rev.* 21. is not medicinall, that they may be humbled, but for their everlaſting ſhame and deſtruction; and therfore a ſeparation from the Church by way of diſcipline is here intended, not any excluſion out of heaven.

Page 140. Eraſtus. *All Legall uncleannes is puniſhed with excluſion, but no man for corruption of nature is excluded out of the Church.*

Anſ. We grant all, and therefore legall uncleannes did hold forth actuall ſcandalouſneſſe, not naturall corruption.

Eraſtus. *The actions of unclean men were puniſhed by death,* Ergo, *Not by excluſion out of the Church.*

Anſ. The Antecedent is not univerſally true: Capitall faults, as I ſaid before, were onely thus puniſhed; the conſequence is null.

Page 142, 143, 144, 145. Eraſtus. *He that was legally unclean did defile all beſide him, even veſſels, places, garments; but Theeves, adulterers doe not defile, but theſe that conſent to their wickednes; nor did they defile the places; The adulterous women brought to the Prieſt and temple, did not defile the Prieſt or Temple,* Ioh. 8. *Nor did* Moſes *and others abſtain from the worſhip, the Manna, &c. becauſe many wicked men did partake thereof, nor were the veſſels purified after wicked men touched them; therefore it followeth not, becauſe God is more offended with the ſacrifices of the wicked, then of thoſe that are onely legally uncleane, that therefore wicked men are no leſſe to be debarred from the holy things, then thoſe that are legally unclean.*

Anſ. This is to diſpute with God; God made a law, that he who being legally unclean, ſhould touch men or things legally unclean, ſhould pollute; This Law, God freely made as a poſitive ſtatute; who can tye God to make the like Law touching thoſe that are morally uncleane? no man: now becauſe God made no ſuch Law, it leaveth not off to be the ſinne of the Prieſts, that they brought the *uncircumciſed in heart to the Sanctuary,* as God complaineth,

Ezek.

Ezek. 44. 8, 9. *c.* 22, 26. And that the Church should hinder the wicked to pollute the holy things of God. 2. The adulterous woman was brought to the Priest and Temple to be judged, God had so commanded, and therefore no wonder she polluted neither Priest nor Temple, but had shee not polluted the Passover Morally, though I say not Ceremonially, if she had eaten without Repentance and offering for her sinne? I thinke she would.

Erastus. *Though God punish not pollution of holy things, by debarring men from them, it followeth not that he winketh at them, for he punisheth them with death, and more grievously.*

Anſ. But by this that God punisheth the pollution of non-converting Ordinances with death, we gather that the Church should also hinder the pollutions of them, and punish Swine that trample on Pearles, and not prostitute holy things to their lust. *Beza* said, those that were unclean, had need of Sacrifices, *Ergo*, They were guilty of sinne. *Erastus* saith, that externall uncleannes *was not sinne, but because it put us in mind of our naturall corruption, that had need to be purged in Christs blood.* *Anſ.* The breach of a Law is sin, a Ceremoniall Law is a Law. 2. It was punished often with cutting off from the Congregation, but God did not cut off men from the Congregation for naturall corruption, as *Erastus* granteth. Page 146. Page 140.

Erastus. *If legall uncleannes were sinne, God would not have commanded it*: But God commanded, or at least permitted the Priests and others to pollute themselves with the dead, *Levit.* 21. *Ezek.* 44. *At nemo propter ingenitam naturæ corruptionem punitur.*

Anſ. It is weakly argued, for the father to kill the sonne, then should be no sinne; God commanded *Abraham* to offer up his son *Isaac*; it is not properly a defiling, nor a sinne, when God *Levit.* 21. willeth the Priest to be neer those of his kin when they die, it is Gods owne exception from the Law, though to come neere to others when they are dead be sin. Gods commanding and forbidding will is the formall cause and rule of obedience and sinne. Page 147. Legall uncleanesse was sin.

Erastus. *Where finde you that the Priests were to judge whether any had repented, that so he might be admitted to the Temple?* Page 150.

Anſ. It is written, *Ezek.* 44. 99. *c.* 22. 26. the Priests should not have admitted *the uncircumcised in heart to the Sanctuary*; *Ergo*, they should have tryed if they were such ere they admitted them. Yea, if in the very day of his oblation ere he offer, the sinner must first restore what he hath unjustly taken away, *Lev.* 6. 4, 5, 6. *Ergo*, The

Prieſt except he rule unjuſtly, ſhould judge whether he have *firſt reſtored it in the principall, and added the fift part more into it*, Leviſ. 6. 5. As *Ezra the Prieſt ſtood up, and ſaid unto them, yee have tranſgreſſed, and have taken ſtrange wives,--now therefore make confeſſion, and ſeparate your ſelfe from the people of the Land, and from the ſtrange wives, Ezra, c.* 10. *v.* 11, 12. And this they did ere they ſacrificed; *Ergo*, the Prieſts judged of their repentance, before they were admitted to Sacrifice: and the waſhing of the hands in Innocency before the perſon compaſſed the Altar, *Pſal.* 26. 6. muſt be tryed by the Prieſt, if not, the Prieſt offered to God the Sacrifice of fooles, and did eate the ſinnes of the people, in offering for contumacious impenitents.

Eraſtus *ſaith, the putting away of their wives was a civill buſines, and belonged to the Magiſtrate.*

Anſ. Ezra was a Prieſt, and *Shechaniah* ſaith, *ver.* 5. *Ariſe, this matter belongs to thee*, and he is ordinarily called *Ezra* the Prieſt.

CHAP. 8. Queſt. 4.

How Eraſtus *acquitteth himſelfe, in proving that the place* Mat. 18. *maketh nothing for Excommunication.*

Lib. 2. *c.* 2. *p.* 154. 155. The ſcope and ſenſe of *Mat.* 18. perverted by *Eraſtus.*

ERaſtus. *The ſcope of the Lord is to teach how great an evill ſcandall is, and how without offence ſcandals of vveake may be removed, becauſe vvhen vve referre an injury to the judge, the vveak may be ſcandalized: he ſpeaketh not here of great injuries to be removed by Excommunication, but of leſſer, and private ones betvveen brother and brother, before we bring them before heathen judicatures proper to Heathens and Publicans.*

Anſ. There is no ſcope of our Saviour to prevent heathen judicatures dreamed of in the Text, nor a ſhadow thereof, *Vel per decimam tertiam conſequentiam.* 2. He ſpeakes not of ſmall injuries onely. 1. Chriſt muſt not be ſtraitned in his words; he ſpeaks of ſcandals in generall, *ver.* 7. *Woe to the vvorld, becauſe of offences*, they be not light that bringeth a woe upon the world. 2. He ſaith *indefinitè*

indefinitè, If thy brother shall trespasse against thee, this is comprehensive of all offences; 3. Hee speakes of such offences, from which I am *to gaine my brother*. Verse 15. But I am to gaine him from all, great or small. 4. He speaketh of such as I must bring before the Church, in case of my brothers obstinacy; but that is comprehensive of all, *verse* 17. 5. He speaketh of such as are bound in heaven, these be great and small, *verse* 19. 6. He speakes of such as I must forgive, *v.* 15. but I must forgive all *to seventy seven times* as *Luke* 17. 7. He speaketh of such as being persisted in, maketh a brother no brother, but as *a Heathen and a Publican*, but great and publike Scandals rather doe this, then small and private ones.

Our Saviour speaks of all, not of private and lesser scandals onely.

Erastus. *The sense is When thy brother, that is, any Iew, doth thee an injurie, study to reconcile him to thee thy self alone; if thou speed not so, assay the same before two or three Witnesses: but if neither so thou can free thy self of injurie, tell the Synedrie, that is, tell the Magistrate of thy people, or thy own Religion; but if he will not heare the Magistrate, then thou mayest without the offence of any, deale against him, as a Publican, and an injurious Heathen, who will acknowledge onely the Roman judicature, and pursue him there.*

Page 26. in Thes. 41.

Ans. If this be the sense, it is farther from the understanding many miles then the words; a common reader may come after, and finde a more native sense. 1. *If thy brother offend thee*, &c. should not be restricted to the Iews onely, nor the Gentiles onely, the Disciples, for the most were *Gentiles* and neerer *Christians* then *Iewes*. 2. Brother is as large as the offender, as those of the Church. 3. As large as the offender, to be gained, *Paul* was to doe what he could to gaine Iewes and Gentiles, and both may offend. 2. Christs scope is not so much to free the Plaintiffe from injuries, (it is a carnall like glosse) as to remove Scandals and Stumbling blocks out of the way of both; and gaine the offenders soule. Observe that the Exposition of *Erastus* is so wilde, that sense, scriptures, or Greeke Authors cannot dream that (let him be as a Heathen) can be in sense all one with this, *Pursue him for his injury before the Roman judicatures*. But the Exposition we give according to the word in its first notion, doth offer it selfe to the understanding: For, *Let him be to thee, as an Heathen*, is, *let him be counted as one that is without the Church, and not of the people of God*, as the word Heathen is taken, *Levit.* 25. 44. 2 *King.* 17. 8. *Psal.* 2. 1. *Psal.* 44. 2.

By the word brother is not meant a Iew onely.

Psal. 46.6. *Jer.*9.16. *Lam.*1.3. *Ezek.*20.23. *Lam.*1.10. *Act.*4.27. *Cor.* 5.1. *Eph.*2.11. 1 *Thes.*4.5. 1 *Pet.*2.12. *Rev.*11.12.

3. It will be long, ere Scripture make a parallell to this; *Tell the Church*, that is, *Tell the King, tell the civill judge*, that is, *tell not the Church*; For the Church dealeth with spirituall Armour (and the King is not the Church) 2. with no force or violence, but the word and discipline; 3. with the mans conscience, to gain the man to repentance, for so all Christs three steps is to save the soul and to gain him to repentance.

Erast. conf. Thes.l.2. c.1.p.133. *Sive faciorosos fa einoris pæniteret, sive non pæniteret, pæna non minuebatur.*

Erastus layes a good Iron club over the offenders shoulders, and brings the offender to a Civilian, to whom Christ never committed the Gospel: What? shall the justice of peace, preach Christ to the offender, and wield the rod of *Christs power out of Zion to him*? Is there no way but that to gain a soul? 2. He brings him to one who hath no weapon, to a Magistrate, but a weapon of steel, the sharp sword; or 3. will this *Magistrate* not labour to gain him, which clearly is Christs intent (O he is greedy in his stairs to have the lost gained, as is *ver.* 11.12.) then Christ misseth his end. But whether the man repent or no (saith *Erastus*) the Magistrate as such, must cudgell the offender. 4. It is admirable that (*Let him be to thee as a publican and a Heathen*) must be a new Judicature, and this is to drive him to *Cesars* Tribunall; a strange glosse: but

L.2.cap.2. page 155.

1. This will loose him out of hand; will *Nero* and the Heathen judge, Preach him back a submissive Lamb to the Iews? But. 2. How do you this *Citrà offensionem*, without scandalizing? *Paul* cannot advise what *Erastus* doth; he thinks Christians should rather suffer injuries, then to implead a brother before a Heathen judge, 1 *Cor.* 6. Yea, but ere you suffer so (saith *Erastus*) *cause him to compear, and answer the highest Heathen judge on earth, to teach him better manners*: This is a vindictive-like way: 2. Scandalous *heathens* will say, *See how these Disciples of Jesus agree*: 3. Its the highest rupture of love, 1 *Cor.*6.

Erastus. *By my exposition, I do not,* as *Beza* saith, *take away a brotherly pardoning of all injuries, for though Christ teach us how to compose and remove only private iniuries piously, and without the scandalizing of the vveak, it followeth not therefore Christ teacheth that only private injuries are to be pardoned; doth Christ teach no other thing? I never thought that only light injuries are to be pardoned:*

ned: When either we chide him, or he vvillingly acknovvledge his fault, vve are to pardon him, for if vve must bring a small injury to the Church, far more must vve bring a greater injury.

Ans. 1. Christ would so many injuries to be pardoned, as is comprehended in this generall (*If thy brother trespasse against thee, rebuke him*) but this comprehendeth great injuries, and all injuries: It being as *Erastus* saith, parallel to *Lev.* 19. 18. *Thou shalt not suffer sin in thy Brother.* What? must we not suffer a small sin in our Brother, because that were to hate him in our heart? But we may suffer great sins in him, and not rebuke him; yet that should not be hatred of our Brother. 2. Christ is not only teaching how to remove scandals; but how to remove them *by gaining our Brother, even by telling the Church*; If need be, that they may labour to gain him also, if one brother, and if one with two or three witnesses cannot gain him to repentance; and so he would have all injuries pardoned, out of which we are to gain our brother. 3. It is too narrow a compasse, to which *Erastus* draweth Christ in his words, only to remove the scandall without offending the weak, to labour to remove only petty scandals and not great; yea, and publick to our whole Church: 4. *Erastus* seemeth to imagine, if we draw our brother before the Church, that is, the *Civill Magistrate*, we do not then forgive him, it being now a great injury, but he is deceived, we are to forgive our brother, and to pray for his forgiveneſſe; even when we make the offence publick, and when he repenteth not, as Christ did forgive as man, those that Crucified him, though they did not repent, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21, 22, 23. *Luk.* 24. 35, 36. 5. *Erastus* cannot deny but great injuries should be brought before the Magistrate, and a little injury, when an offender refuseth to obey the *Christian Magistrate*, must be a great injury, which maketh the man, *as a heathen and a publican*; What is before answered, I shall not need to trouble the Reader withall to repeat. Thes. 41. p. 46.

Erastus. *The reason, vvhy Christ speaketh here of the transaction of private iniuries, is because he speaketh alvvaies in the singular number, if thy brother offend thee, rebuke him betvveen him and thee alone, take tvvo other, &c. tell thou the Church, Let him be to thee, as a Publican; he that is Excommunicated, is not Excommunicated to one only, but to all the Church.* Pag. 156.

Ans. This shall make the whole ten Commandments, *Exod.* 20

and

and the whole Gospel and the profession of it, *Rom.* 10.9. which are all spoken to one in the singular number, often in the second person to command private vertues, and forbid private sins only, and not to be Laws obliging the Church in publick duties, and to eschew publick sins.

Erastus Answereth, *Let him be to thee who art injured, and to all that are injured, as a Publican, not to the whole Church, for there be some lawes that agree privatly to the Magistrate, and to none other, some to Parents, not to children, to Masters, not servants, so neither is this precept to all Christians as the Decalogue is, and such like, but only to those that are privately hurt; he saith not, rebuke every brother thou meetest with, but the brother that sins against thee. Christ speaketh not in the third person, nor to the Church, for the Disciples were not the Synedrie, or that Church.*

Christs speaking in the second person, argueth not the privacy of the scandall.

Ans. 1. Its most false, that all the precepts of the Decalogue are all of them spoken to all and every man: *Honour thy Father and mother that begat thee*, is one of the Commandments; and it is not spoken to those that are onely Parents themselves, and have their naturall parents dead: but doth it follow that that Command doth injoyne private obedience, and forbid onely private, not publick disobedience to naturall Parents: So the sixth Command saith, *If thy brother fall in a Lyons den to the hazard of his life, pull him out; if thou cannot rescue him thy self alone, take three with thee and assay it; if thou cannot so rescue him, tell it to twenty*: The man is not to rescue every brother here, but onely the brother that is in danger to be devoured with the Lyon: will any say the Law of the sixth Commandment is given here, to one private man to help another in a private danger? This (*rebuke thy brother*) is the Law of nature, and it is under this, *Levit.* 19.17. *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart*: And if I rebuke him not for sinne, any sinne, and the most publick, and so most offensive and scandalous to many; I hate him; nay, I am not so much to rebuke him and gain his soul, because the sin is an injury done to me, as because it is done against the Majesty of God, and destructive to the offenders soule, and I must labour to *gaine his soule*. 2. *Erastus* dreames that that is a private sin, which is done to one man, or one ranke of men; to a Magistrate,

giſtrate, not a ſubject; he is beguiled, an offence and publick ſtumbling-block may be laid before one man, and it is often a publick ſin. 3. The ſpeaking of it in the ſecond perſon is nothing, for, *If thou beleeve thou art ſaved*, Rom. 10. 9. is as publike and univerſall, as *John* 3. 16. *Whoſoever beleeveth he is ſaved.* The ſecond perſon in all precepts of Law and Goſpel (and this, rebuke an offending brother, is both,) is as broad as the third perſon, and as large in extent, except you ſay the verſe *John* 3. 16. comprehendeth ſome more beleevers that are ſaved, then *Rom.* 10. 9. which is againſt ſenſe. 4. Chriſt ought not to have ſpoken to his Diſciples as a Church, becauſe he is directing them as members and parts of a Church, how to deale with an offender: but if he heare not the Church, that is, the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, he ſhould die, ſaith *Beza*. *Eraſtus* anſwereth, *But the Church or Iewiſh Synedrie had not power of life and death now they were under the Roman Empire.* Page 158.

Anſ. Chriſt here then ſheweth not a way to remove Scandals, becauſe the Roman Emperors ſword is not Chriſts Spirituall way, 2 *Cor.* 10. *The weapons of our warfare are not carnall, but mighty through God.*

Eraſtus. *By this ſame place, I cannot prove there is ſuch a thing as Excommunication, what is ſaid to one is ſaid to the whole Church; but it is ſaid to one, that he ſhould forgive an offending brother, ſeventy ſeven times in one day, if he acknowledge his fault*; Ergo, *there can be no juſt cauſe why the whole Church ſhould not doe that which every member is obliged to doe, but your Presbyters will puniſh though any one ſhould confeſſe his fault.* Page 156. 157.

Anſ. There is a twofold forgiving, one private, in paſſing the private revenge of the fault and grudge againſt the perſon of the offender: thus the whole argument is granted, for Members and Church both are to pray, *Forgive us our ſinnes, as we forgive them that ſin againſt us*: I hope the Synedrie, the *Roman Preſident*, the *Magiſtrate*, thus are obliged to forgive thoſe whoſe heads they juſtly take from them, ſo *Luke* 17. We are to *forgive our brother ſeventy ſeven times a day*, though he neither repent nor crave pardon, but far more, if he crave pardon. But by this Argument the Chriſtian Magiſtrate ſhould uſe the ſword againſt no bloody Parracide, for he is thus to forgive him, and much more, if he ſay he repenteth. 2. To forgive, is to remit all puniſhment, and ſo what is A twofold forgiving.

ſaid

ſaid to one Member of the Church, is not ſaid to the whole Church. Private men have not power of Church-puniſhment to forgive it. The Church hath a power limited by Chriſt, that is to forgive and open heaven, in ſo farre as they ſee Chriſt goe before, and ſee the man penitent, and therefore *Eraſtus* his conſequence is ſhort, it followes not, *that the Church ſhould no more excommunicate, then one Member.* *Eraſtus* looks farre beſide the booke, in that he thinkes it is all one to forgive an injury, and to remove a ſcandall in the way of Chriſt in labouring to gaine a brother. I may forgive one that offendeth me, and not labour at all to gaine his ſoul.

Theſ. 42. page 27. Eraſtus. We cannot expound εἰς σὲ *againſt thee, againſt the Church, becauſe he ſaith after, tell the Church, then the ſenſe ſhould be, O Church tell the Church.*

Anſ. It is not denyed by us, but that the Scandall in the riſe may be private, but *Eraſtus* will have our Saviour to ſpeake onely of private Scandals. 2. If one Church ſhall offend another, the offended may admoniſh, and if the Church be not gained, the offended Church is to tell more Churches Synodically conveened, as may be gathered from Chriſts Scope, to remove all Scandals between brother and brother, Church and Church.

Page 16. Eraſtus. *Tell him between thee and him, if it be told me* conſcio, *I onely knowing, then he hath ſinned againſt me privately; ſhould I not reprove him before others, if he have ſinned againſt others? but Chriſt will not have me to take any Witneſſes at the firſt.*

Anſ. 1. I may tell him between me and him, a publike fault: this proveth onely my admonition to be private, when the fault is known to twenty and ſcandalizeth them, and it proveth not the fault to to be private. But you will ſay, then I muſt take theſe twenty who are offended, no leſſe then I am to goe my ſelfe. I anſwer, not ſo; For 1. I may be ignorant that any knowes it, and I am not to uncover what God hath covered, except it were a ſin that bringeth wrath on the whole Land, as blood, and the *Canaanites* ſinnes. 2. Though I ſhould know twenty were offended, charity will bid me try, if I onely can gaine him, and then love maketh the worke eaſier to twenty.

Eraſtus. *But* Matthew *and* Luke *compared together, doe teach that Chriſt ſpeaketh of ſuch ſinnes, as one Brother may pardon another ſeventy ſeven times; and the queſtion of* Peter *to Chriſt, how oft ſhall my*

my brother offend, and I forgive him? saith that Christ speaketh not of the sinnes, that the Church onely can forgive, for Peter *knew well, that he his alone could not forgive these sins, which onely the Church and a multitude can pardon.*

Christ speaketh not of such sins as private men may forgive as *Erastus* dreameth.

Ans. Though it be true, *Matthew* and *Luke c.*17. speake both of scandals and scandalous sins in generall, yet it is evident they speak of two sorts of scandalls; *Luke* speaketh *v.* 3. of scandals between brother and brother, which may at first be taken away by rebukes; but he hath nothing of the Churches part touching these. But *Matthew* hath it at length, *chap.* 18. *ver.* 15,16.17,18.19.20. Then *Luke* 17.4. and *Matthew* more distinctly, *chap.* 18. *ver.*21. upon the occasion of *Peters* question, resolveth a case of conscience; how Christians are to passe by in love the faults one of another, *even to seventy times seven*; they are not scandals of one and the same nature, as *Erastus* conceiveth: The former is, how we may gain an offending brother from the guilt of active scandall in giving offence to us, and that is by free rebuking; and if that gain him not, then by taking witnesses and rebuking him; and if neither that can do it, *by telling the Church*, to which Christ hath given a more powerfull way, *to binde and loose in earth and heaven*, saith *Matthew*: *Luke* speaketh onely of simple rebuking, which tendeth to the other two. The latter way, is how we our selves may be freed from passive scandall, if our brother provoke us *seven times, or seventy seven times a day*: this must be by a private pardoning, and laying aside all grudge, or hints of revenge toward our brother, and this is a great mistake in *Erastus*, that he confoundeth those two scandals, which by two Evangelists are distinguished, for *Peter* upon occasion of the former Church-scandals, proposeth the second, Mat. 18 21. *then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and* I *forgive him? Peter* asketh nothing of gaining the offender, and Christ answereth nothing of gaining him, having satisfied them fully in that before: But *Peter* came in with a new question, concerning private forgiving. 2. It is evident in the former, that Christ speaks not of sins, that one brother may forgive another; for then it were free to the offended, after two admonitions ineffectuall to gain the offender, to forgive and desist, as he doth in the matter of forgiving: But it is not free to him to desist; if the offender refuse to be gained, and adde contumacy;

the offended cannot pardon the punishment (he ought to remit the private grudge) he is under a command of Christ *to tell the Church*, that is one punishment, and if he yet be obstinate, *he is to be reputed as a Heathen and a Publican*, that is another punishment, which a private man cannot dispense with: 1. He cannot dispense with Christs command. 2. He cannot omit all Lawfull means of gaining the soul of his brother; for the Law of nature tyeth him to it. *Erastus* will have it a matter of holding off of an injury, only by complaining to the *Roman Emperour*, a carnall way. Christ is on a higher and more spirituall strain to gain a soul, as is clear, *If he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother*, rest there: *But if he hear thee not*, go yet on to gain him: *Take with thee two or three*, then if he had been gained at first, a second admonition before two or three were needlesse. But if yet he be not gained, then go yet on, to seek the gaining of his soul; and *tell the Church*, and if the Church cannot gain him: then *let him be as a Publican*, and cast out: This is also a way of gaining, *that his spirit may be saved*, 1 Cor. 5. Therefore this is most false, that Christ speaketh of those sins which we may forgive: Who can believe that it is credible that our Saviour hath a more noble end, and more excellent then to gain a brothers soule? or that he doth teach us in these words to discend from such a spirituall end, as the repentance of an offender, to a far baser end, to hold off injuries by fleeing to a heathen Iudicature?

Christs scope spirituall, *Erast.* his way is carnall.

Thes. 42. pag. 28.

Erastus. *Christ speaks of such sins, as the offender cannot deny before Witnesses. But sins to be punished by Excommunication, so hainous, as deserveth to be delivered to Satan, he would deny*; Ergo, *he must speak of smaller sins.*

Ans. This is for us, he speaketh of such sins that the offender will persist in, against the Authority of witnesses, Synedrie, or *Church* and *Magistrates*, as *Erastus* thinketh while he be as a *Profane Heathen*; *Ergo*, he may deny them: 2. If we suppose three faithfull witnesses, who have seen and heard, such as will testifie the sin before the Church, it is like to be a grievous and publick trespasse. Nor would Christ have the Magistrate troubled, and the Church offended for such sins as may fall out, in a brother, seve times; yea, seventy seven times in one day, and may be, by private transactions pardoned, as *Erastus* saith: How should *Erast*

his civill throne, sink under threescore and ten scandalls in one day?

Erastus. *The Church punisheth not the man for such sins, but dismisseth him as an injurious person.* Lib. 3. c. p. 181.

Ans. True, if we believe *Erastus* begging the question. 2. To declare a brother, no brother, but a prophane Heathen, without Christ in the world, nad out of the Covenant of Grace, must be the highest *Church-censure*, & must be more highly punished then so.

Erastus. *I call them light faults only compared with crimes punished by the Law.*

Ans. Such as contumaciously defended, makes a man none of Christs, but the prophanest living; yea, of a believing *Jew*, an *Apostate*, and a *Heathen*, deserveth to be punished by the judge.

Erastus. *If the offended be willinger to suffer the injury then to compeer before a heathen judge, he may.*

Ans. There be no smell of an Heathen, or *Roman Judge* in the Text, Id *Erastus adjecit de suo.* 2. It is not free to gain, or not gain, my brothers soul, or obey Christs command, or not obey it.

Paul, 1 *Cor.* 6. forbiddeth us to implead our brethren before *Heathen Judges*; *Erastus* saith, Christ commandeth the contrary: *Erastus* answers, *Paul saith in these that are* ἐλάχιστα *and* βιωτικὰ in smaller matters, as of goods we should not.

Ans. Its true, *Paul* giveth instance, in those that he calleth things of this life, but in opposition to the great matter of *Judging the World* and *Angels*: 2. *Paul* saith generally; *Ye go to law one vvith another*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4. And he esteemeth it such a fault, that he saith of it, *v.* 9. *Knovv ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*

Erastus. *Paul himself appealed to a heathen judge Cesar.*

Ans. True, but not for small offences falling out seventy seven times a day, for which the *Magistrate* will not punish, such as these offences be, saith *Erastus*, *pag.* 181. *pag.* 28. *Thes.* 42. But being accused of a high crime of life and death. 2. He appealed not from a godly Magistracy, such as the Synedry holdeth forth, but from bloody judges: 3. In matters not with Saints, as 1 *Cor.* 6. And brethren to whom you are to grant pardons, seven, and seventy seven times a day, but with Blasphemers, and Murtherers of Christ, *Act.* 18. 6. 1 *Thes.* 2. 15.

Pag. 186. 187. Erastus. *Christ teacheth how private iniuries may be removed, vvithout offence by the Magistrate, but not hovv vve may reduce to repentance a brother that giveth scandall.*

Ans. Theres not a footstep of injuries, or *Magistrate*, or sword in the Text: 2. *ver.* 7. And all along he speaketh of scandalls that may hinder our entring to heaven, and these words; rebuke him, *Thou hast gained thy brother*, are clear as the Sun, that he intendeth the offended, in all these steps, is to gain the soul of the offender.

Erastus. *This is no Argument at all, he speaketh of gaining an offending brother*: Ergo, *His scope is not to repair any civill losse*: *But I pray you, a brother argueth an iniurious man, and convinceth him of his error; hath he not first gained him to God, and then to himself, vvhile he maketh him of his enemy his friend? can there be a better way of compounding private iniuries? if his conscience be healed, will he not leave off to be iniurious?*

Ans. I may say, as he saith to that Apostolick servant of God, holy *Beza*, *Egregia vero ratiocinatio*: The question is now touching the scope of Christ, *Matth.* 18. *Erastus* proveth repairing of civill injuries to be Christs scope, and how proveth he it? *Because he that is gained to God by repentance, is a made friend, and vvill leave off to do civill vvrongs:* Iust as if one should say, the scope of the holy Ghost, in the history of the Creation, in the two first chapters of *Genesis*, is to make the Reader a good *Philosopher*: Why? because he that understandeth the works of Creation, the Heaven, Stars, Sun, Moon, Seas, dry Land, Trees, Herbs, &c. Must not this man be an excellent *Astronomer*, *Geographer*, *Physiloge*, *&c*? So may he say, the scope of the *holy Ghost*, in the ten Commandments, is to make a man an excellent Citizen of *London*, or *Paris*, Why? how is that the scope of the ten Commandments? by *Erastus* his Argument, What better way can there be to make a good sociall Civilian, then if he be well versed in the Doctrine of the ten Commandments? so may I say, the scope of *Paul* in the first eleven Chapters of the *Epistle* to the *Romanes*, is to make a man love his brother, why? Because if he know God, and free justification by faith in Christ, and our freedom from the Law, and the Doctrine of Election by Free-grace, and the like, he cannot but love his brother: Now how can that be Christs scope, which is neither

ther ſpoken *In terminis?* Nor ſo much as inſinuated? Now *to gain an offending brother is* In terminis *ſpoken*, ver. 15. *Thou haſt gained thy brother*: ſo *Eraſtus* granteth this is Chriſts ſcope, but not his laſt ſcope; and gaining of his ſoul he will have, but a ſcope for a civil end to hold off injuries: How carnall is the gloſſe of *Eraſtus*? Now the ſcope of *Eraſtus* is never ſpoken, never hinted at: *Eraſtus* cannot deny our ſcope, onely he will not have it the chief ſcope of the words; the beſt ground he hath for his ſcope is that, *Tell the Church*, is, *Tell the Civill Magiſtrate.*

Eraſtus to put a good face on the buſineſſe, ſaith, ſcanning on the ſenſe of the words, *Chriſt therefore ſaith rebuke him*, Matth. 18. *That we may underſtand, that he is to be convinced of his error, and iniquity, that he may acknowledge it not onely to us, and before men, but far more to God, and ſo thou haſt gained thy brother, and loſt him, if he refuſe to hear thee*, that is, *If he ſuffer not himſelf to be convinced, and do not acknowledge his fault, he is bound in Heaven, and this is that which I would ſay, this gaining of him is the pardoning* (of a civill wrong) *that he may be received in friendſhip.* Pag. 188.

Anſ. If Chriſts intention be, that he may rather acknowledge his fault to God then to the offender, as *Eraſtus* granteth, then Chriſts ſcope in theſe words, muſt be his ſpirituall gaining to God, not a civil depulſion of a civill wrong, but the former *Eraſtus* granteth: 2. If ſpirituall gaining be intended in all the ſteps of our Saviours progreſſe, and when this is obtained, the progreſſe doth ceaſe; then means rather croſſing and thwarting that ſcope, then ſuitable ſpiritually thereunto, are not to be attempted: then is not civill depulſion of injuries our Saviours ſcope in the words, but the former is true; *Ergo*, So is the latter; the Propoſition is evident, from the nature of a ſcope, and end in any ſpeech. I prove the Aſſumption by parts: 1. If rebuking of an offending brother, gain him to repentance, then it is clear the offended man is to reſt there, and not to *Tell the Church or Magiſtrate*, for he hath obtained even the end, for which *Eraſtus* contendeth, and who goeth about new means to compaſſe an end already obtained? Chriſt would never command that; yea, when Chriſt ſaith, ver. 16. *If he hear not thee, then take with thee one or two more*; Ergo, If he had heard him, he was not to take one or two more, and *ver.* 17. *If he ſhould neglect to hear them, he was to tell the* Church: *Ergo*, If he ſhould hear

then,

them, he was gained, and was not *to tell the Church*; Ergo, spirituall gaining must be Christs scope. 2. If to *tell the Church*, be as *Erastus* dreameth, to tell the *Civill Magistrate*, and then the *Roman Emperour*; this was no suitable mean to gain the mans soul; a club was never dreamed of by our Saviour to compasse the spirituall end, or neereſt *scope of gaining any to repentance*; for the end of the Magistrate, as a Magistrate, is to bring no man to repentance, but *to take away evil out of the land*, to cause *Israel fear, and do so no more*, to be *an avenger of evil doing*, far lesse is there any shadow of reason to dream that Christ intended by *Cesars*, or any Heathen *Magistrates* sword, to gain an offending brother to repentance, and that he commandeth the offended brother to use such a carnal mean so unsuitable to such a spirituall end. Lastly, How a private brother cannot be said to binde and loose, I have cleared alreadу.

Erastus. Least these words (Let him be to thee as an Heathen) should seem to make the offender every way as an Heathen; therefore he addeth a restrictive word, (and a Publican) and he addeth the article ὁ common to them both, so as he speaketh not of every Heathen and Publican, but of those who were conversant amongst the Jews, and none of those would answer to any Judge, but the Roman Emperour or his deputies, being the servants of the Romans, to vex the people of the Jews.

Ans. Here is a groundlesse conjecture, for a Publican was large as odious as a Heathen, being a companion to sinners, and the worst of the Heathen.

A Publican most odious to the Iews.

2. How proveth he that ὁ ἐθνικος, that *Heathen* is meant of those *Heathen only, that were servants to the Romans, and would acknowledge no Iudge but* Cesar. 1. The Iews themselves said, *We have no King but Cesar*: 2. The holy Ghost doth not restrict the Heathen so; What warrant hath *Erastus* to be narrower in his glosse then the holy Ghost is in the Text. If in these, (*Let him be as an Heathen*) the threatning be perpetuall, to remove all scandals, to the end of the world; when most of the Heathen shall not acknowledge the Iudicatures of *Heathen Rome*, then the word Heathen must be as large as all Heathen, all wicked and all scandalous men, such as *Publicans*, and so there is no hint at the Heathen Romish Iudge here, which is the way of *Erastus*. But the former is true; for this Law of Christ is to remove scandals amongst the Disciples when

when the Roman Empire ſhall fall as the Lord in his word hath prophecied. The Scripture ſpeaks not ſo, *Mat.* 6. 7. *Vſe no vain repitition in prayer.* ὥσπερ οἱ ἐθνικοί, Here is the Article οἱ: Can *Eraſtus* ſay none uſe babling prayers but ſuch heathen as were ſubject to the Roman Empire? *Gal.* 2. 9. *That we* ſhould goe εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, to the Heathen, here is an Article alſo; belike *Paul* ſhould preach to no Gentiles but thoſe under the Roman Empire: A frothie dream, *Gal.* 3. 8. *The Scripture foreſeeing God would juſtifie* τὰ ἔθνη, *the Gentiles.* Here alſo an Article; belike then no Gentiles are juſtified by faith, but theſe that are Officers to the Romans, and vexed the Iewes, *Act.* 18. 6. *Henceforth I will goe* εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, *to the Gentiles*, Act. 21. 19. *Paul* told *what things the Lord had done by his Miniſtery* ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *amongſt the Heathen*, Act. 26. 23. that *Chriſt ſhould ſhew light to the people,* καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *and to the Heathen,* not the Romiſh heathen onely, except Chriſt be a Saviour to no other *Heathen* in the world: I need not weary the Reader to refute theſe unſolid conjectures of *Eraſtus.*

Eraſtus. *Converted Publicans were not ſcandalous, as touching their office*; Ergo, *A publican ſignifieth not one that is none of the Church*; Zacheus *after his converſion remained a Publican.* Lib. 3. c. 3. p. 190, 191.

Anſ. Converted *Publicans* left not off to be Publicans, but they left off to be ſuch as went under the name of Publicans; that is, abominable Extortioners and grinders of the Poore: and therefore it followes well, that to be as a *Publican* in the common ſpeech of the Iewes familiar to our Saviour, was to be a wretched godleſſe prophane man, without the Church, and without God and Chriſt in the world, as alſo the Heathen were, *Eph.* 2. 11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. 1 *Pet.* 4. 3, 4. *Acts* 21. 11. *Rom.* 2. 24 blaſphemers of the Name of God, and 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. *Yee know that yee were Gentiles carried away with dumbe Idols*, Eph. 4. 17. *That ye walke not as other Gentiles, in the vanity of their minde.* 18. *Having the underſtanding darkned, being ſtrangers from the life of God*: Theſe and many other Scriptures confirmeth me much, that in Chriſts time *to be as a Heathen and a Publican*, was to be caſt out, whereas the man was once a brother, a beleever, and a member of the Church, and in profeſſion in the covenant of *God*, and a brother to *Peter*, *Iohn* and the Lords Diſciples, and a Chriſtian and profeſſing Saint, as the diſciples of Chriſt were; but now one who is turned out of

that

that ſociety, and as a *Gentile ſerving Satan, walking in the vanity of the minde, as an uncircumciſed man*, &c. This is as like Excommunication, as one egge is like another, we have cleare Scripture for this Expoſition, but it is good *Eraſtus* never gave us one ſyllable of Scripture for his expoſition: Nor can it be ſhewen that to be as a *Heathen and a Publican* by Scripture, or any that ever ſpoke Greeke, is to be in ſubjection to the Roman *Empire*, or lyable to their lawes, onely we have ἀυτος ἐφη of *Eraſtus* for it.

Page 191. Eraſtus. *Who ever by no law of God or command was execrable, and could for no juſt cauſe be hated, by no Law of God could bee debarred from the Temple and holy things of God. But ſuch were the Publicans*; Ergo,

Anſ. 1. The Major is falſe. The Leper becauſe a Leper was by no Law of God curſed, and execrable, nor was he worthy of hatred, but of pitty; yet was he by an expreſſe Law debarred from the Temple and holy things of God.

2. The Minor is falſe in the ſenſe we contend for, the office of
P. 192, 193. a Publican *in abſtracto* was not execrable, nor worthy of hatred: but the thing ſignified, and that which proverbially went under the name of a *Publican* amongſt the Iewes, to wit, a profeſſed extortioner, a robber, a grinder of the face of the poore, is both execrable and hatefull: the concluſion in the former ſenſe is granted, and it is nothing againſt us: But in the latter ſenſe, the Aſſumption being falſe, the concluſion followeth not; not to ſay that in ordinary, none was a Publican, but he that was either an heathen, and ſo execrable, or then an Apoſtate wretched leud Iew.

Eraſtus. *But I have demonſtrated that no man was debarred from holy things for Morall uncleanneſſe, then neither ſhould a Publican be counted a ſeparated man, will Chriſt command him to be caſt out whom the Iewes could by no Law caſt out?*

Anſ. If we give the matter to *Eraſtus* his word, all he ſayes are demonſtrations: Let the reader read and judge. 2. All his argument here proceedeth on a falſe ground, while he contendeth ſo much to juſtifie Publicans he preſumeth (to be as a Publican) to be in our ſenſe all one with this, (to be excommunicated.) But 1. we lay the leaſt weight on the word (*Publican*) and more on this, (*to be as an heathen.*) 2. We take them not diviſively, but as Chriſt ſpeaketh them, copulatively. We ſay, not to be excommunicated, is

all

all one, as, let him be as a *Publican*, but that to be excommunicated, is to be *as an Heathen* καὶ ὁ τελώνης and *as a Publican.*

Erastus. *The article* ὁ *is set before both the word* (Heathen) *and the word* (Publican) *by the holy Spirit, which signifies either the very nature of the predicate* (*heathen and Publican*) *or must put a great Emphasis, and a great edge of difference between the Heathen and Publican here, and in other places, as these be not one*, Petrus est, ἄνθρωπος, et Petrus est, ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Peter *is a man,*) *and* Peter *is the man, or that man.*) *So when we say, pleasure is that good thing,* τὸ ἀγαθὸν, *that chiefe happinesse; We say more then when we say pleasure is good, so* ὁ τελώνης *that Publican must signifie a Publican, as a Publican, if there be an Emphasis here common to both the heathen and the Publican, now there can be no other thing in the matter of eschewing Scandals common to both, but that both acknowledged no other but the Roman Magistrate, and therefore, except you make* (*to be a Publican,*) *&* (*to be debarred from the Sacraments*) *all one; you have not another place in all the New Testament for your Excommunication, for no Publican because a Publican, was debarred by Gods Law*, Jure divino, *from the Sacraments.* Pag. 195. 196.

Ans. 2. All the wits on earth cannot make us see another place for *Erastus* his explication of this place *Matth.* 18. and of 1 *Cor.* 5. But we hope it shall appeare we have more from Scripture, to say for Excommunication then this one place, or then *Erastus* and all his party can say against it; here is all that *Erastus* can say against this strong place, builded upon one Article ὁ; a poore and ignorant Grammattication. 1. He culleth out the word (*Publican*) of lesse weight with us, from the word (*Heathen*) and would prove that no *Publican* because a *Publican*, and for the office, was debarred from the *Iewish* Sacraments, which we grant; for no office or place lawfull in it selfe, debarred any from *Christ*; *Centurions* were hatefull to the Iewes, and put over them by the *Romans*, yet I should conceive the *Centurion*, whose servant *Christ* cured, *Luke* 7. was a Proselite, and a member of the *Iewish Church*, a lover of the Nation, else I see not how the Iewes would have accepted that he should build them a Synagogue, as he did *v* 5. and *Publicans* might have bin Proselites also, but that which was signified by a *Publican* to the *Iews*, was no lesse odious then the name of a hangman or a most wicked and flagitious man, as *Matth.* 5. 45, 46, 47,

A publican most odious to the Iewes.

46,47. and by Christ decourted from the number of the children of our heavenly Father: Amongst the Iews it was counted abomination to eat with Publicans, *Matth.* 9. 11. *Matth.* 11. 19. *Luk.* 7. 34. And when Christ saith, *Matth.* 21. 31. of the Rebellious Iews; *Verely, I say unto you, that* οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι, *the publicans and harlots shall enter into the Kingdom of God before you:* He clearly maketh Publicans the wickedst of men; shall these two, οἱ οἱ make us think *Erastus* were not dreaming, if he should from these words gather that Christ, meaneth only of such *Publicans and Harlots as acknowledged no other Magistrate, but the Roman Magistrate?* And the Article οἱ is doubled in the following verse also. 2. Let us retort this Argument, he that heareth not the admonitions of brethren in secret, and of the Church in publick, is to be reputed, not as a Iew, or a brother and member of the Church having right to the holy things of God, but as a Heathen.

Now a Heathen to the Iews was no brother, and had no right to the Sacraments, either of the Iewish, or Christian Church, as is clear by the word of God, therfore he that heareth not a brother in secret, or the Church in publick, is to be reputed as no brother (I mean in that publick visible way he once was) but as a *Heathen*, who hath no right, *Iure divino*, by Gods Law to the Sacraments. 3. What means all this trifling about the Article ὁ? Say that the Article ὁ should restrict *Heathens and Publicans*, to such and such *Heathens and Publicans*: I shall deny, *In eternum*, this consequence, *Ergo*, He means no other but only such *Heathens and Publicans*, as did acknowledge no other *Magistrate*, but a *Roman Magistrate*. There is no shadow in the Scripture, or any Greek author for the Word, but rather ὥσπερ signifieth the qualitie and spirituall condition of any, especially when Christ speaketh of gaining of souls, as here, *Mat.* 18. 15. so I am sure ὡς signifieth *Ioh.* 1. 14. *Mat.* 6. 10. 1 *Pet.* 1. 19. so doth ὡσαὐτως signifie *Mat.* 6. 5. and elsewhere, though I deny not but it may signifie a civill or naturall similitude, but Christ doth here speake of neither, as is cleare. 4. If here a *Publican* as a *Publican* be meant, as *Erastus* saith; *Ergo*, All *Heathens* and all *Publicans* are here to be understood; *Ergo*, Not these only that had this common to them both, to wit, that they both acknowledged no civill Magistrate but the *Romans*, the contrary of which *Erastus* asserteth. 5. Yea, this is not emphatick and discretive of

Heathen

Heathen and *Publican*, Christ acknowledged no civill Iudge as King over the *Iewes* at this time but onely *Cesar*, when he said *Mat.* 22. *Give unto Cesar, the things that are Cesars, and to God the things that are Gods.* And the *Iewes* themselves did so when they said, *We have no King but Cesar*; If then to be as an *Heathen and a Publican*, bee all one as to acknowledge no King, nor judge but *Cesar*, then *to be as a Heathen and Publican*, must be all one with this, *to be as Christ* and the *Iewes*, for this was common to *Heathens*, *Publicans*, *Iewes* and Christ, to acknowledge *Cesar* was their onely King and civill Judge. 6. They were the worst of the *Heathens* and *Publicans*, who in a peculiar manner acknowledged no lawfull Iudge but *Cesar*, and hated the *Iewes*, the onely Church of God most at this time; *Ergo*, If the Article do inferre that a disobedient brother is most like these *Heathen*, they must be greatest enemies to the *Iewes*, and so remotest from Circumcision, and all right to the holy things of God, being the worst of the Heathen, and so *Erastus* hath gained nothing, but lost much by his poore Grammattication. Yea, if the offended brother should repute the offender as the worst of the Heathen, he is to esteeme him who was once a Member of the Church, in that he was obliged to heare the Church, now as a Heathen, and so no brother, no Member of the Church, and here *Erastus* must grant that one brother may un-church and Excommunicate any other for disobedience to the Church, but the Church may not.

Erastus. *They are as absurd who say, by Publicans here are understood wicked men, for then by Heathen must be understood also the wickedest of the Heathen, and not all the Heathen dwelling in Iudea.*

Ans. I deny the consequence, for by *Publicans* are meant men wicked and unpure by conversation, and by *Heathen* men unclean by condition, because without the Church, *and strangers to the Israel of God*, and without Christ and God in the world. 2. We have proved what is meant by a Publican, by evident Scriptures, but that by a Publican is understood one who acknowledged no Magistrate, but a *Roman*, no Scripture; no Greeke Author warranteth us to thinke it, never man dreamed it, but *Erastus*.

Erastus. *The Pharises hindred not Christ and his Apostles to come to the Temple.*

Anſ. Chriſt was a born Jew and circumciſed; yea, and what can the Practiſe of the Murtherers of Chriſt prove? It is no Law. But the Romans never ſacrificed in the Temple, but gave Liberty to the Iews to ſerve God, according to his word, and to hear Chriſt preach, and that Chriſt kept the Ceremoniall Law, and taught others, even the cleanſed Leapers ſo to do, *Matth.*8. is clear.

No private forgiveneſſe, *Mat.* 18.

Eraſtus. *Private men do forgive ſins*, Matth.18. Luk.17. Ergo, *to binde and looſe is not a proper judiciall act of a Court*, Matth.16. *Chriſt ſpeaketh not to Peter only, but to all the faithfull, who by teaching one another, may bring one another to acknowledge their ſin, and if they do it they are pardoned, if not, their ſins are bound in Heaven.*

pag.198. *Sed ſi docendo (privatus) aliquem adduxerit, ut peccata ſua agnoſcat, et ex certâ fide in Dei benignitate propter meritum Chriſti acquieſcat, an non ſolutus erit? Si fruſtrâ moneat ac doceat, an non qui ſic pertinaciter ſalutem repudiat, ligatus.*

Anſ. To theſe the keys are given, who retain and remit ſins, as *Eraſtus* ſaith: But theſe be ſuch as are ſent of Chriſt, as the Father ſent his ſon, *Ioh.*20. 2. Either in this place there is given power to binde and looſe by publick preaching the word, or by ſome other place; but this power to binde and looſe by publick preaching, is only given to Paſtors and Teachers, 1 *Cor.*12.29. *Eph.*4. 11.12. And *Eraſtus* granteth elſewhere, that every private man by his office cannot preach, nor adminiſter the Sacraments, and by no other place is this given to Paſtors, for I could elude all places, with the like anſwer, and ſay there is a publick Baptizing and Adminiſtration of the Supper, by Miniſters and ſent Paſtors only, and a private alſo performed by private Chriſtians; yea, by a woman, and both are valid in Heaven, and the binding and looſing of both ratified in Heaven. 3. Chriſt ſpake this to the Diſciples, who before were ſent to Preach, and *caſt out Devils*, *Matth.*10. and ſaith not, *Whom thou bindes on earth*, but in the plurall number, ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε, *What things you binde on earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven. Eraſtus* ſaith all this upon the fancy, that binding and looſing of the Church, and *Peters* private forgiving of his bro her ſeven times a day muſt be all one, which I do prove in another place to be different, and amongſt other reaſons this is one, becauſe the Church pardoning hath a threefold order: 1. between brother and brother: 2. before two or three: 3. Before the Church, and the end of all is the gaining of the offending brother, *Matth.* 18.15,16,17,18,19,20. But the private forgiving of a brother, of

which

which *Peter* speaketh, *Mat.* 18. 21, 22, 23. and *Luke* 17. 4, 5. is of an inferiour nature; for I know not, if you can gain a brothers soule seven times a day, if he but say, *It repenteth me, Luke* 17. 4. or seventy seven times, *Mat.* 18. 22. These words, *It repenteth me,* said seventy times a day to the Church cannot satisfie to the gaining of a soule, whereas to the private remitting of revenge, it were enough. We have the Text to warrant us, that Christ spake to Stewards to whom the keyes are committed. *Erastus* doth but wickedly assert, he spoke to those who were as Christians in that act, but the Text is cleare he speaketh of binding and loosing spiritually, which is nothing to the holding off of a civill injurie, which *Erastus* saith is the scope of our Saviour here, and how hungry must that sense be: *That you deal with him as With an Heathen, Who acknowledgeth no Iudge, but a Roman judge, is a matter ratified in heaven?* 4. A private man is to forgive an injury even though the offender repent not, *Mat.* 14. 15. *Rom.* 12. 19, 20. *Col.* 3. 13. but that pardon cannot be ratified in heaven. 5. See what we have said of binding and loosing before.

Binding and loosing proper to Stewards.

Erastus. *Though Christ should speake this onely to Ministers, yet it followeth not that he speaketh this to other Presbyters.*

Ans. That dependeth on the proving that there be ruling Elders in the Church, which I conceive I have proved else where, from *Rom.* 12. 8. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. I conceive when Christ spake this, there was neither a formed Presbytery, nor a formed Church.

Erastus. *Christ saith not, if two or three Presbyters, or two or three Ministers agree in one, I will heare them, but Where two or three Christians agree.* Page 199.

Ans. Nor doe we say, that two or three can make an Excommunicating Church, but Christ argueth *a minore,* if the Lord heare two or three on earth, farre more will he heare a Church, and ratifie in heaven what they doe in binding and loosing offenders in Earth; But how shall these words agree to the interpretation of *Erastus*? for he expoundeth two or three and the whole Church, to be but one Christian Magistrate; can he be said to agree to himselfe? Or can one or two, or three meet together in Christs Name? And what coherence is here? Two or three conveeneth to pray that he that will not hear the Christian Magistrate may be

dealt

dealt with as a Heathen man before the Roman judge, how violent and farre off is this gloſſe, and how unſuitable to the Text?

Page 199. Eraſtus. *What other thing is it to a private brother, to gain another to himſelfe, and to God, then binding and looſing in Heaven?*

Anſ. To bring him before the civill Magiſtrate either Chriſtian or Heathen, whoſe intrinſecall end by vertue of their office, is not to gaine ſoules, but to draw the blood of ill doers, is farre from gaining of Souls.

Eraſtus. *Though binding and looſing be judiciall and forinſecall words, they agree not to the Miniſtery onely, but rather to the Magiſtrate, except you ſay that in the time of Chriſt amongſt the Iewes, there was a Church court beſide the Magiſtrates court.*

Anſ. That they argue authority judiciall, is proved already by many Scriptures, and judiciall authority Eccleſiaſticall it muſt be, which agreeth to the Church, and it was never heard that the Church eſpecially in the New Teſtament, doth ſignifie the Magiſtrate. 2. There is no neceſſity to ſay there was a Chriſtian Church court in Chriſts time, becauſe there was not a Chriſtian Magiſtrate at this time, but the Iewes had then a Church-court, before which Chriſt was conveened. *Caiphas* being Preſident, and the blinde man, *Iohn* 9. who was *caſt out of the Synagogue*, for that he *confeſſed Chriſt*. 3. Chriſt ſpeaketh of that which was to be, though in its frame not yet erected.

Eraſtus. *Chriſt hath the like words of binding and looſing*, Mat. 16. *which ſignifieth alſo to preach the Goſpell, that he who beleeveth may be looſed, and he who beleeveth not may be made inexcuſable, and therefore it is no other, but to pray a brother to deſiſt from his injury, ſhewing him that that is acceptable to God: for to binde and looſe in all the Scripture, is never to debarre any from the Sacraments; if you divert your brother from doing an injurie, by declaring the will and wrath of God, out of his Word, thou haſt gained him, and looſed him, if he will not be perſwaded, the wrath of God abides on him, and thou haſt bound him.*

Anſ. If *looſing and binding* Matth. 16. be preaching of the Word of God, and looſing be Chriſtian forgiving of an injury, then are women who are taught in the prayer of Chriſt, *Mat. 6. to forgive one another*, inveſted with the keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven, to preach the Goſpell; and why not alſo to adminiſter the Seals?

Seals? and ſo are all private men clothed with the keyes to take in and caſt out at their pleaſure, and what are Miniſters *that are over the people in the Lord, and watch for their ſoules?* 2. We never ſaid, to binde was to debarre from the Sacraments, except conſequently onely, to binde, is to declare an obſtinate man as a Heathen, and ſo no member of the houſe of Chriſt, and *conſequently* to have no right to the bread of the children of the houſe, nor ſay we, that to Excommunicate is formally to debarre men from the Sacraments, it is to caſt them out of the houſe: hence it muſt follow that the priviledges of the houſe belongeth not to them. 3. You may diſſwade a man from doing a civill injurie, and never gaine his ſoule, but the Magiſtrates club, for which *Eraſtus* contendeth in theſe words, cannot reach the ſoule.

To Excommunicate is not formally to debarre from the Seales.

Eraſtus. *None can remit a debt but the creditor, nor pardon an injury but he who ſuffereth the injurie.*

Anſ. Then none can binde and looſe but private men, and the keyes of heaven are given to all private perſons, nor can private perſons by forgiving, ſo remit the perſon as he is looſed in heaven. 2. The Church is offended at Scandals, and are ſufferers; *Ergo*, The Church muſt binde and looſe: Let *Eraſtus* teach us the way except by Church-cenſures.

Eraſtus. *Caſting out of the unclean is not to binde, becauſe to purifie is not to abſolve, the unclean might be purified by any cleane, and not by the Prieſts onely.* Page 201.

Anſ. The legall purging of the Leper, was onely by pronouncing him *cleane, and could not be done but by the Prieſt, and it was a looſing of him.*

Eraſtus. *Where Chriſt inſtituteth any new ordinance, he omitteth nothing that is ſubſtantiall, but here he ſpeaketh nothing of publike ſins, for which you doe eſpecially excommunicate.* Page 203.

Anſ. Chriſt according to the minde of *Eraſtus* does here inſtitute a throne for the *Chriſtian Magiſtrate*, how doth he then inſtitute a way how the *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* may remove private Scandals and not publike? for publike Scandals hurt the Church ten to one more then private doe. Chriſt ſpeaks of ſins in their riſe private, betweene brother and brother, but he ſpeaketh of publike Scandals, of ſuch as will not heare the Church, and for theſe onely we Excommunicate. 2. That is not true, that any one

place

place of Scripture, where an institution is that all the substantials of that institution, should be expresly set down in that place, it is enough that all be held forth in either one Scripture, or other, as in Christs sufferings, Baptisme, Pastors, &c.

Erastus. πάλιν λέγω ὑμῖν· *Again I say unto you, if two of you shall agree on earth, these words must referre to private men, not to the Church, it is cleare that Christ speaketh nothing of two, as hee doth in this verse, but when he saith that one private man is to rebuke and gain another private man; nor is it enough to say its an argument à* comparatis, *for if the same thing be not kept in both extreames, it is a vaine comparison if you say a childe understandeth this*; Ergo, *An aged man understandeth it, it followeth well. But if you say a child understandeth this*; Ergo, *An aged man is rich and good*; *who would not laugh? But if God heare the prayer of two*; Ergo, *farre more will he heare the prayers of the Church, it followeth not, except you say, if those things that two or three bindes on earth be ratified, how shall we thinke, that that is ratified which the Church bindes and looses?*

Pag. 203. 204.

Ans. Here is nothing but Grammatications that cannot convince: it is true, that Christ speaking of two, he speaketh of private men, but many will not grant so much, for they say, that by two the smallest number is meant, a Church of the fewest, by a *Synecdoche*, and two may be taken for a small convention and number which doe literally exceed two, *Jer.* 3. 14. *Rev.* 11. 3. *I will give power to my two Witnesses*; they be more Martyrs who witnessed against *Babylon* then two literally, and this Exposition seemeth to me as good as the other, and then if the smallest Church doe binde and loose in heaven and earth, so much more the Church; and so all shadow of this unsolid Grammattication is removed. 2. The proportion is well kept, if two praying on Earth be so heard in Heaven, as by their prayers, they may obtaine that these be ratified in Heaven which they aske on earth; farre more is that ratified in heaven, which the Church in a judiciall and authoritative way, doth on earth, in *the Name of Christ*: for praying of private Christians, and publike and authoritative binding of the Church doe both agree in this, that the Father of Christ ratifieth both in heaven, which is a due keeping of proportion, and not such a crooked comparison

as

as *Eraſtus* would make between an aged man, & a *rich & good man*
3. Though two private men have the ſame Analogicall binding in Heaven and earth with the Church, it followeth not that the binding of the Church is not a *Church-binding*, as the binding of the two private men is alſo a binding, but no publick, no Church-binding. 4. How ſhall Chriſts words keep either ſenſe or Logick with the expoſition of Eraſtus? *If he will not hear the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, complain to the Heathen Magiſtrate; and again I ſay, if the Lord hear two praying on earth, far more will he ratifie in Heaven, what a prophane Heathen Magiſtrate doth on earth againſt a Chriſtian offender*; judge what ſenſe is in this gloſſe.

Eraſtus hath no reaſon to divide theſe words, ver. 19. *Again I ſay, if two agree, &c.* from ver. 17. 18. Becauſe they are meant of the Magiſtrate (ſaith *Eraſtus*) againſt all ſenſe, and joyne them to the words of the 15. and 16. verſes: for there is no mention of binding and looſing by prayer, ver. 15, 16. But only of rebuking, and here *Eraſtus* ſhall be as far from keeping his proportion, of rebuking and praying, as he ſaith, we do keep proportion between Church-ſentencing and praying. To *Theophylact Chriſoſtom* and *Auguſtine*, *Beza* anſwered well, and *Eraſtus* cannot reply: 6. If there be binding and looſing between brother and brother in the firſt and ſecond Admonition, before the cauſe be brought to the Church, what need is there of binding the man as a Heathen before the Heathen Magiſtrate? And what need of the Heathen Magiſtrates prayer to binde in Heaven? Was there ever ſuch Divinity dreamed of in the world?

Eraſtus. *Theſe words, Tell the Church prove only that the Church hath the ſame power to rebuke the injurious man, that a private man hath, this then is poor reaſon: The Church hath power to rebuke an offender*; Ergo, *it hath power to Excommunicate him.* Theſ. 44. 29.

Anſ. All know that Chriſt aſcendeth in theſe three ſteps: 2. *Eraſtus* granteth the cauſe is not brought to the Church, but by two or three witneſſes which is a judiciall power, as in the Law of *Moſes* and in all Laws is evident: if he hear not a brother, he is not to be eſteemed, *as a Heathen and a Publican*, but if he hear not the Church, he is to be reputed ſo. 3. We reaſon never from power of rebuking to the power of Excommunication; but thus, *The Church hath power to rebuke an offender, and if he will not hear*

the Church, then is the man to thee, that is, to all men, as a Heathen and a Publican; Ergo, *The Church hath power to Excommunicate.*

Thes. 46. pag. 32. Erastus. *Christ speaketh of the Church that then was: How could he bid them go to a Church that was not in the world; they having heard nothing of the constitution of it? did he bid them erect a new frame of Government, not in the world?*

Ans. He could as well direct them to remove scandals for time to come, as he could after his Resurrection say, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Go teach and baptize all Nations*, which commandment they were not presently to follow, but *Act.* 1. 4. to stay at *Jerusalem*, and not *To teach all Nations*, while the Holy Ghost should come: I ask of *Erastus*, how Christ could lay a Ministery on his Disciples, which was not in the world? What directions doth Christ, *Mat.* 24. and *Luk.* 21. give to his Church and Disciples that they had not occasion to obey many years after? as how they should behave themselves, when they should be called, *before Kings and Rulers*: 2. Nor were the *Apostles* who were already in the room of Priests and Prophets to Teach and Baptize (he after being to institute the other Sacrament) to wonder at a new forme already half instituted, and which differed not in nature from the former Government, save that the Ceremonies were to be abolished.

Christ might well give directions for a Church not yet erected.

Lib. 3. cap. 3. p. 196. *Vestra igitur excommunicatio nihil aliud est, quam quane figmentum hominum imperare, aliis expientium.* Erastus. *Only* Matthew *mentioneth this pretended new institution, not* Luke, *not* Mark, *the Disciples understood him well, they aske no questions of him, as of a thing unknown, only* Peter *asked how often he should forgive his brother.*

Ans. This wil prove nothing, *Iohn* hath much which we believe with equall certainty of Faith, as we do any Divine institutions; shall therefore *Erastus* call the turning of water into wine, the raising of *Lazarus*: The healing of the man, born blinde, and of him that lay at the *Pool of Bethesda*, Christs heavenly Sermons, *Iob.* cap. 14, 15, 16. his prayer, *cap.* 17. which the other *Evangelists* mention not, *Figmenta hominum*, mens fancies, as he calleth Excommunication? 2. Did the *Disciples* understand well the dream that *Erastus* hath on the piece, and took they it as granted, that *to tell the Church* is to tell the civill Magistrate? And that not *to hear the Church* is civill Rebellion, and *to be as a Heathen* is to be impleaded before *Cesar* or his Deputies only? This is a wonder to me; *Matthew* setteth

teth up this way, an institution of all *Church-Government*, which no *Evangelist*, no word in the Old, or New Testament establisheth.

Erastus. *Christ would not draw his disciples, who were otherwise most observant of the Law, from the Synedry then in use, to a new Court, where witnesses are led before a multitude and sentences judicially set up, it had been much against the Authority of the civil Magistrate, and a scandall to the Pharisees, and the people had no power in Christs time to choose their own Magistrate, therefore he must mean the Jewish Synedry: If by the Church we understand the multitude, we must understand such a multitude as hath power to choose such a Senate, but there was no such Church in the Jews at this time.* Thes. 48. 34, 35.

Ans. That the Church here is the multitude of Believers, men, women, and children, is not easily believed by us. 2. And we are as far from the dream of a meer civill Synedry, which to me is no suitable mean of gaining a soul to *Christ*, which is our Saviours intention in the Text. 3. *Erastus* setteth up a christian Magistrate to intercept causes and persons, to examine, rebuke, lead witnesses against a Iew before ever *Cesar* their only King of the Iews, or his Deputies hear any such thing, this is as far against the only supream Magistrate, and as scandalous to the *Pharisees*, as any thing else could be: 4. Had not *John Baptist*, and *Christs* disciples drawn many of the Iews and Prosylites to a new Sacrament of Baptisme, and to *the Lamb of God*, now in his flesh, present amongst them? this was a more new Law, then any Ordinance of Excommunication was, especially since this Church was not to be in its full constitution, till after the Lords Ascension.

Erastus. *It is known this* Sanedrim *delivered Christ bound unto Pilate, condemned* Steven, *commanded the Apostles to be scourged and put in Prison.* Tertullius *saith of* Paul *before* Felix, *we would have judged him according to our Law*; Paul *said*, Act. 23. *to* Ananias, *thou sittest to judge me according to the Law*, Act. 26. Paul *confesseth before* Agrippa *and* Festus, *that he obtained power from the high Priests, to hale to prison and beat the Christians, and* Paul *for fear of the iniquity of this Church or Sanedrim, dealt with them as Heathen, and appealed to Cesar.* *Ans.* But by what Law of God did they this? It is not denyed but the Iews *Synedrim* being two courts

did inflict punishment; But that *Christ* establisheth a civill *Sanedrim* as a mean, *Matth.* 18. To gain the soul of a brother is now the question; we utterly deny this, and gave reasons before thereof, to which I adde, if any obeyed not the *Church*, that is, the *Sanedrim*, as *Erastus* saith, they might be stoned to death as *Steven* was: Was this *Christs* milde way, to cite them onely before the Romane Senate? Were dead men capable of answering to any further Iudicatures? 2. The last step of conveening *Heathens and Publicans* before the *Romane Senate*, according to *Christs* order is not to be observed with them, for even *Heathens and Publicans*, are so far forth our brethren: that 1. We are not, when they offend us, *to suffer sin in them, but to rebuke them as Christians*, Lev. 19. 18. For this is the Law of nature: The Law of nature will teach us not to hate an Heathen in our heart. 2. We are to labour to gain all, even *those that are without the Church*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 19, 20, 21, 22. 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. And this is *Christs* way of gaining all, to rebuke and admonish them: *Ergo*, it was never *Christs* meaning to deal with Heathens and Publicans so, as at the first we are to drag them before the Heathen Magistrate, that by his sword he may gain them, or take away their life; yea, and *Erastus* granteth in Ecclesiasticall crimes, that the Iews had power of life and death, in the matter of *Steven* and of *Paul*, if he had not appealed to *Cesar* to save his head: *Josephus* de bel. *Iudaic. Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 26. *Antiquit. Lib.* 14. *Cap.* 12. But in things politick, *Cesar* took all power of life and death from them: Hence only is *Christs* time the footsteps of the two distinct courts remained, and the Priests, not the civill Magistrate had the power of *Church-discipline*. But all was now corrupt.

CHAP. IX. Quest. 5.

The 1 *Cor.* 5. vindicated from *Erastus* his glosse. Lib. 3. c. 4. pag. 211. 212.

The place 1 Cor. 5. *for Excommunication, vindicated from the Objections of* Erastus.

ERastus. *Paul did nothing contrary to the Command of Christ: But Christ excluded no man from the Passeover, not* Iudas; Ergo,

go, *Neither minded he to exclude the inceſtuous man; he ſaith not,* 1 Cor. 5. *Why debarred you him not from the Sacrament? But why did you not obtain by your tears and prayers, as* Auguſtine *expoundeth it, that the man might be cut off by death?*

Anſ. Chriſt would not take the part of a viſible Church on him, to teach us that none ſhould be caſt out of the *Church* for ſecret and latent crimes: 2. *Paul* did nothing without the Command of Chriſt: But Chriſt neither in the Old, or New Teſtament, commanded his Church to pray for the miraculous cutting off of a ſcandalous perſon; give an inſtance in all Scripture, except you make this one which is contraverted, your inſtance.

Eraſtus. Paul 2 *Cor.* 2. *abſolveth the man from all puniſhment,* Pag. 214. *and nameth onely* ἐπιτιμία *rebuking.* Ergo, *He was not excluded from the Sacrament.*

Anſ. Excluſion from the Sacrament, is but one of the fruits of Excommunication; not formally Excommunication; yet he harpeth on this alway, *that to be excommunicated, or to be delivered to Satan, is but to be debarred from the Sacrament.* 2. The anſwer preſuppoſeth he was Excommunicated, we urge the place for a precept only of Excommunication, if he repented to the ſatisfying of the Church, there was no need of Excommunication. 3. If the man 2 *Cor.* 2. was delivered from rebuke onely, and if that was all his puniſhment; *Ergo*, he was not miraculouſly cut off, for then he muſt have been miraculouſly cut off, and raiſed from death to life againe, unleſſe miraculous cutting off had been no puniſhment: But if he was not miraculouſly cut off, becauſe he prevented it, then with what faith could the whole Church pray for the miraculous killing of a brother, and not rather that he might repent and live? 4. In all the Word of God, the intrinſecall end of putting to death a Malefactor, is to avenge *Gods quarrell*, *Rom.* 13. 4. *That all Iſrael may hear and feare, and doe no more any ſuch wickedneſs*, Deut. 13. 11. *To put away the guilt of ſinne off the Land*, Numb. 34. 33, 34. *that the Lords anger may be turned away, and a common plague on the Church ſtayed, when juſtice is executed on the ill doer*, *Pſal.* 106. 28, 29, 30, 31. And it concerneth the Church and Common-wealth, more then the ſoule of the Malefactor; and there is nothing of ſuch an end here. But the intrinſecall end here, is, that the mans *Spirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Ieſus*,

The prayers of the Church interveen not for this particular miracle.

Jesus, and this delivering *to Satan is in the Name and authority, and by the power of the Lord Iesus*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. 5. Now the *Sonne of man came to save soules*, not to destroy bodies, and burne cities; and though by the power of Christ, *Peter* miraculously killed *Ananias* and *Saphira*, and *Paul* stroke *Elimas* the Socererer blinde, yet these being Miracles, we heare not that this was done by any interveening act of the Church conveened, or by their prayers to bring vengeance, by a miracle, on the ill doer. *Peter* and *Paul* doe both these not asking any consent, or intervention of the peoples prayers, but by immediate power in themselves from the *Lord Jesus*. 2. If any such power were given to the Church, by their Prayers to obtain from God a miraculous killing of all scandalous persons, who infecteth the Church, in case the civill Magistrate were an Heathen, and an enemy to Christian Religion and refused to purge the Church; *Christ*, who provideth standing remedies for standing diseases must have left this miraculous power to all the christian Churches in the earth that are under *Heathen Magistrates*, or some power by way of Analogie like to this, to remove the scandalous person, but we finde not any such power in the Churches under *Heathen Magistrates*, except power of refusing to the offender the Communion, and rejecting him as an *Heathen and Publican*, that he may be ashamed and repent. 3. The whole faithfull at *Corinth*, men, women and children and all the Saints (for to those all, is this power given, as *Erastus* saith) must have had a word of promise (if they ought to have prayed in faith as the *Prophets* and *Apostles* prayed in faith, that they might work miracles) that *Paul* was miraculously to kill the incestuous man: But that all and every one who were puffed up, and mourned not at this mans fall, had any such word of promise I conceive not imaginable by the Scriptures, for the Proposition I take it as undeniable; if *Paul* rebuked the *Corinthians* all and every one, because they prayed not, and mourned not to God, that *Paul* wrought not this miracle in killing the incestuous man, they behoved to have a word of God, for their warrant, commanding them to pray: O Lord give power to *Paul*, to kill such an incestuous man miraculously: For such Faith of miracles had *Christ*, and all the Prophets and Apostles, *Joh.* 11.41. So did *Sampson* pray in faith, *Judg.* 16.28. and *Elias* 1 *Kings* 18.36,37,38. and so did the Apostles

Faith of miracles to pray for this miracle not in all the faithfull at *Corinth.*

pray,

pray, *Act.* 4. 24, 29, 30. and with them the Church of believers, for working of miracles in generall; for the Apostles had a word of promise in the generall for working of miracles, *Mar.* 16. 17, 18. But that the Apostles had before hand revealed to them all the miracles they were to work: I cannot believe by any Scripture, But that it was revealed to them upon occasion only, by an occasionall immediate Revelation, *Do this particular miracle, Hic & nunc*: And this I am confirmed to believe: Because *Elisha*, 2 *Kin.* 4. was mistaken in sending his servant with his staffe to raise the dead son of the *Shunamite* (a Pastor with nothing but a club and naked words cannot give life to the dead) *ver.* 31. and therefore the working of a miracle in particular *Hic & nunc* was not alwayes revealed to the most eminent Prophets, such as *Elisha* was; and so I beleeve, as working of miracles on this; and this man, came not from an habit in the Prophets and Apostles, far lesse from a habit subject to their free will, but God reserved that liberty to himself, to act his servants immediatly, both to pray by the faith of this miracle, *Hic & nunc*, and to work this miracle, *Hic & nunc*. Now to the Assumption: How can *Erastus* or any of his followers assure our conscience that God had given the Faith of miracles to *all the sanctified in Christ Jesus at Corinth*, whom Paul so sharply rebuketh, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. That this being revealed to them by God, and they having the faith, that it was the will of *Jesus Christ*, that *Paul* should kill, or (as some say) *deliver to Satan* this incestuous man to be miracuously tormented in the body or flesh, as *Iob* was, that he might repent; is it like Christ would reveal more of his will, touching every particular miracle to be done by *Paul*, to all and every secure one in the Church of *Corinth* that were puffed up, and mourned not for this mans fall, then he revealed to the *Apostles* themselves? But I have proved that the Apostles and Prophets knew not, nor had they the particular Faith of this, and this miracle, how then had all and every one of the *Church of Corinth* this Faith? Now they behoved to have this light of Faith of this miracle revealed to them, that this was *Christs* will, that *Paul* should work a miracle for the destruction of the man; else the *Corinthians* could no more be justly rebuked, because they prayed not to God, that *Paul* might work this miraculous destruction of the man (which yet he never wrought, as is clear, 2 *Cor.* 2. he

was not killed, but repented, and was pardoned) then becauſe they prayed not, that he miraculouſly might cure the criple man at *Lyſtra*, *Act.* 14. or that he might work any other miracle. Now how was this revealed to all of the Church of *Corinth* that this was *Chriſts* will? If it be ſaid, they were to pray conditionally that God would either by a miracle take him away, or then in mercy give him repentance to prevent deſtruction: 1. We have no ſurer ground for a conditionall and diſjunctive Faith of miracles in the *Corinthians*, then for an abſolute Faith: 2. If it was the will of *Chriſt*, that the man ſhould by himſelf be miraculouſly killed, why did not the Apoſtle immediatly by himſelf kill him? Why? It was the Apoſtles fault as well as the ſin of the *Corinthians*, that the man remained as a leaven to ſowre and infect the Church; yea, it was more the Apoſtles fault then theirs, for he had only the immediate power miraculouſly to purge the Church; ſome may ſay, as the Lord Ieſus was hindred ſome time to work miracles, becauſe of the peoples unbelief, *Matth.* 13. 58. So here *Paul* was hindred to work this miracle on the ſcandalous man, becauſe of their unbeliefe.

Delivering to Satan not miraculous.

Anſ. *Paul* could not profeſſe this; for he had not aſſayed to work any miracle of this kinde, as *Chriſt* had done, *Matth.* 13. But only ſheweth them of a report came to him of the fact, and of their ſecurity, and not mourning: 2. *Paul* ſhould then rather have rebuked their unbelief, and not praying that God would miraculouſly deſtroy the man; but this *Paul* doth not. 3. *Paul* rebuketh them, *for not judging him, not putting him out of the midſt of them*: Muſt that be *Pauls* meaning; *pray to God that I may have grace and ſtrength immediatly from God, to kill him miraculouſly, and to judge him.* Now they knew the Apoſtle miraculouſly thus judged thoſe that are without, as he ſtroke with blindneſſe; *Elymas* who was without the viſible Church: I conceive the whole Churches were to pray, as the Apoſtles do with the Saints, *Act.* 4. 29. 30. That miracles may be wrought both on *thoſe that are without and within*: But of this judging he ſaith, *ver.* 12. *What have I to do to judge them alſo that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within?* 4. It is directly contrary to *Chriſts* direction, *Matth.* 18. Which is, that by rebukes we gaine the offending brothers ſoul: Now *Eraſtus* will have him gained to Chriſt,

by

by removing his ſoule from his body, and by killing him. Yea, the Apoſtle writing of the cenſuring of thoſe in *Theſſalonica*, who walked unorderly, and obeyed not the Apoſtles Word, which doth include ſuch as breake out in Inceſt, Adulteries, Murthers, is ſo farre from giving direction to kill them miraculouſly, that he biddeth onely keep no Church company, nor Chriſtian fellowſhip with them, but yet they are to be admoniſhed as brethren; *Ergo*, they were not to be miraculouſly killed, for then they ſhould be capable of no admonition at all being killed; And could there be worſe men then was amongſt the *Phillipians*, *Enemies of the croſſe of Chriſt*, *whoſe end is deſtruction*, *whoſe God was their belly*? Yet there was no blood in the Apoſtles pen, he chides not the *Phillipians*, nor the *Galathians* who had amongſt them men of the ſame mettall, *Gal.* 5. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Ver.* 19. 20, 21. Nor the *Timothies* who would have to doe with farre worſe men, 2 *Tim*, 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Nor *Titus* who had to doe with wicked *Cretians*, *Tit.* 1. becauſe they cryed not to God, for *Pauls* bloodie ſword of vengeance, that theſe wicked men might be cut off by Satan, nor doth the Apoſtle to the Hebrewes draw this Sword againſt thoſe who ſinned *againſt the Holy Ghoſt*, c. 10. c. 6. Nor *Iames* againſt bloody warriours, Murtherers, Adulterers, Oppreſſors, *c.* 4. *c.* 5. Nor doth *Peter* and *Iude* uſe this ſword, or command the Churches to uſe ſuch carnall weapons againſt the wickedeſt of men, but recommended long-ſuffering, rebuking, the rod of Church-diſcipline, to reject Hereticks after admonitions. Hence I argue negatively; in all the Scripture, never did the Lord command that they ſhould pray to God and mourne, that he would inflict bodily vengeance and death, or yet ſickneſſe on any ſcandalous profeſſor, nor is there promiſe, precept, or practiſe in any Scripture of this Church cenſure. 5. *Eraſtus* doth thinke a court of the Church, that hath power to lead Witneſſes, judge and cenſure offenders an extream wronging of the Magiſtrate, and an incroaching on his Liberties, but here is a more bloody Court, for if the whole faithfull are to pray for bodily death by the Miniſtery of the Devill, upon one of their own brethren, becauſe he hath lyen with his fathers wife, or fallen in Adultery, or Murther, as *David* did: Surely they muſt pray in faith, and upon certaine knowledge that he is guilty; the Law of God and Nature muſt

then have warranted the whole Saints, Women and Children, to meet in a grand Jurie and Inqueſt, either to have the fact proved by Witneſſes, or to heare his owne confeſſion; elſe how could they pray in faith, if it was not ſure to their conſcience that the man *had done this deed*? Here is a Jury of men and women, I am ſure unknowne to the Apoſtolique Church. 2. A greater abridging of the Magiſtrates power then we teach: The Church ſhall take away the life of a Subject, & never aske the Magiſtrates leave. 6. It is againſt Chriſts minde, *Mat.* 18. as *Eraſtus* expoundeth it, that *Chriſtians* ſhould go any further againſt an offending brother, then implead him before an *Heathen*, though he adde injurie to injurie: But this way maketh the *Holy Ghoſt* ſharply to rebuke all the Saints when they are offended, before the barre of Heaven, by crying miraculous bloodie vengeance upon the Offender. 7. It is evident this man repented, and that the *Corinthians confirmed their love to him, and did forgive him*, 2 *Cor.* 2. 7. 10. *Ergo*, He was not miraculouſly killed. But we never read, where it was Gods will and Law that an ill doers life ſhould be ſpared, though he ſhould repent, becauſe his taking away is for example that others may feare. 2. That evill, and as it is here, leaven may be taken away; if then it had been bodily death, I ſee not how *Paul* and the *Corinthians* could have diſpenſed with it. 8. *Eraſtus* doth not, nor can he confirme his unknown Expoſition by any parallel Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament, which I objected to him in his Expoſition of *Matth.* 18. Let the Reader therefore obſerve how weak *Eraſtus* is, in arguing againſt pregnant Scriptures, for Excommunication.

Lib. 3. c. 4. p. 213. Eraſtus. *You muſt prove, that to mourn, becauſe the man is not taken away, is all one, as to mourn that he is not debarred from the Sacraments by the Miniſters and Elders.*

Anſ. That is denyed; to be debarred from the Sacraments, is but a conſequent of Excommunication: 2. It is a *putting of the man from amongſt them*, not by death, that we have refuted; not from eating and drinking with him onely, that I improved before: *Ergo*, it muſt be a Church out-caſting.

Page 215. Eraſtus. *Paul might deliver the man to Satan, though he did Repent; as the Magiſtrate did puniſh Malefactors, whether they Repented, or not.*

Anſ.

An. Ergo, he repented, and was pardoned by the *Corinthians*, 2 *Cor.* 2. 10. after he had been killed, which is abſurd.

Eraſtus. *If to deliver to Satan, were nothing but to debar the man from the Sacraments, ever while he ſhould repent; Why ſhould* Paul *with a great deal of pains and many words, have excuſed himſelf to the* Corinthians, 2 Cor. 2. *and* cap. 7. *and as it were deprecate the offending of them; for they ſhould know, that this manner of coercing and puniſhing, was, and ought to be exerciſed in the Church; if it was but a ſaving remedy and invitation to repentance, Why were they ſad? They ſhould rather have rejoyced, as the Angels of Heaven doth at the Converſion of a ſinner, then* Paul *muſt have intended another thing.*

Anſ. This is a meer conjecture as *Eraſtus* granteth moſt he ſaith againſt the place is; for he ſaith, *Aliam conjecturam etiam addidi*, ſuch a violent remedy of repentance, as is the cutting off of a member from Chriſts body, being the moſt dreadfull ſentence of the King of the Church, neareſt to the laſt ſentence, was to *Paul*, and ought to be a matter of ſorrow to all the *Servants of God*, as the foretelling of ſad Iudgements, moved Chriſt to tears, *Matth.* 23. 37. *Luke* 19. 41, 42. And moved *Ieremiah* to ſorrow, *cap.* 9. 1. And yet Chriſt was glad at the home-coming of ſinners, *Luke* 15. 6, 7, *&c.* Theſe two are not contrary as *Eraſtus* dreameth, but ſubordinate; to wit, (*That Chriſt ſhould inflict the extreameſt vengeance of Excommunication, which alſo being bleſſed of God, is a ſaving, though a violent remedy of repentance,*) and (*To rejoyce at the bleſſed fruit of Excommunication, which is the mans repentance:*) And the Apoſtle 2 *Cor.* 7. profeſſeth his ſorrow, *That he made them ſad*, ver. 8. and alſo rejoyceth at their gracious diſpoſition who *were made ſorry*: He is far from excuſing himſelf, as if he had done any thing in weakneſſe; this were enough, and it is an Argument of our Proteſtant Divines, to prove that the Books of the *Macabees*, are not Dited by the Holy Ghoſt, as Canonick Scripture is; becauſe the Author 2 *Macab.* 15. 38. excuſeth himſelf in that Hiſtory, as if he might have erred, which no Pen-man of holy Scripture can do: And *Eraſtus* layeth the like blame on *Paul*, as if he had repented that he made them ſorry, by chiding them, for not praying for a miraculous killing of a Brother: This is enough to make the Epiſtles of *Paul* to be ſuſpected as not Canonick Scripture; yea, *Paul* ſaith the

Theſ. 58. p. 44. p. 215.

contrary, 2 *Cor.* 7. 9. *Now I reioyce, not that yee were made sorry, but that yee sorrowed to repentance, for yee were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive dammage by us in nothing*, and 2 *Cor.* 2. 8, 9. he exhorteth them to rejoycing, at the mans Repentance, and to confirme their love to him, (which demonstrates that he was now a living man, and not miraculously killed,) and commendeth their obedience, *v.* 9. in sorrowing, as he did chide them that they sorrowed not, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. So that *Paul* is so farre from accusing himselfe for making them sad, that by the contrary, he commends himselfe for that, and rejoyceth thereat. *And if the matter had been Excommunication, while the man should repent,* (saith *Erastus*) *they knowing this ought to be in the Church, they should rather have reioyced, then bin sorry.* And I answer, if the matter had been a miraculous killing of him, *that his Spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord*: should they not reioyce at his saving in the day of the Lord, whether this saving be wrought by bodily killing, or by Excommunication? And so this conjecture may well be retorted. 2. They were not to bee sorry at the mans repentance, but to rejoyce; yet were they to be sorry at the violent mean of cutting him off from Christs body, as a father may be glad at the life and health of his childe, and and yet be sorry that by no other mean his health can be procured, but by cutting off a finger, or a hand of his childe. 3. They knew that miraculous killing (as *Erastus* dreameth) was also a saving ordinance (the remaining in the Church, or not remaining is all one) becaufe *Paul* chideth them, (as he dreameth,) *that the man might be miraculously killed.*

Page 45. Erastus. *What need was there that the Corinthians with such diligence should intercede for the man, if they knew when he repented, he was to be received againe into the Church? Now that they interceded for him is clear, for* Paul *saith,* 2 Cor. 2. 10. *To whom yee forgive any thing, I forgive also.*

Ans. Becaufe there is a great hazard in Excommunication, of an higher degree of obduration and condemnation; if the party be not gained. 2. I see no ground for this conjecture, that the *Corinthians* interceded for him at *Pauls* hand, for if he ought to have been miraculously killed, then whether he repented or repented not, both *Paul* and the intercedors sinned; *Paul* in being broken,

broken, they in requeſting for a diſpenſation of a Law, in which God would not diſpenſe, as he that would requeſt to ſpare the life of a repenting Murtherer againſt Gods expreſſe Law, ſhould ſinne; and *Paul* ſhould ſinne in pardoning upon requeſt, where God would not pardon. Num. 34. 31. 32.

Eraſtus. *How excuſeth* Paul *himſelfe that he would try their obedience, that* c. 7. *he would have their care for him made manifeſt, if he had not commanded a greater thing, then to debarre a wicked man from the Sacraments?*

Anſ. This is but a ſhadow of a reaſon againſt the Word of God, for to be caſt out of Chriſts body, and not acknowledged for an *Iſraelite of God*, and that in heaven and earth: and ſo to be debarred from the Seals, is a higher thing then bodily killing, as to be received as a Member againe, and to be written amongſt the living in *Ieruſalem*, is like the riſing from the dead, as may be gathered from *Rom.* 11. 15. and is farre more then deliverance from miraculous killing.

Eraſtus. *Theſe words, ye was made ſorry according to God, that ye might receive dammage of us in nothing, cannot agree with the purpoſe, they ſhould have ſuffered no loſſe by obtaining pardon to a miſerable man excluded from the Sacraments, while he ſhould repent; but if he was to be killed, they ſhould have loſt a brother, and ſo ſuffered dammage.* 2 Cor. 7 45.

Anſ. The hazard of loſing his ſoule, repentance not being ſo eaſie, as *Eraſtus* imagineth, had been a greater loſſe, then the loſſe of a temporall life, the ſoule being *to be ſaved in the day of the Lord.*

Eraſtus. Paul *requireth his Spirit, and the power of the Lord Ieſus to this worke*; Ergo, *It was more then to debarre from the Sacraments.* Page 45.

Anſ. Eraſtus ſhould prove; *Ergo*, It was more then to Excommunicate. 2. *Ergo*, It was rather more then bodily death. His ſeventh reaſon I hope after to examine.

Eraſtus. Paul *ſaith, he decreed to doe this, and does not command the Church to doe it, or that the Church alone ſhould doe it: We never read that* Paul, *whether alive or dead, did write to one, or many, to deliver any to Satan, for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that was proper to the Apoſtles onely, as the gift of healing was,* Act. 5. and c. 13. Page 45. 46.

and

and he writeth, he will come himselfe with the rod, and he himself
1 Tim. 1. *delivered* Hymeneus *and* Alexander *to Satan.*

The Church, not *Paul* alone had hand in delivering the man to Satan.

Ans. This is much for us, you never read that *Paul* did write to one or many, and did chide them, because they prayed not that he might worke this and this particular miracle; or that without error he might write this or that Canonick Scripture, and therefore because this *delivering to Satan*, was commanded to the conveened together Church, with his Apostolique spirit, and warrant *to deliver such a one to Satan, and to judge him.* v. 12. *And to purge him out, and cast him out*, therefore am I perswaded it was no miracle proper to *Paul* onely. 2. How prove you that *Paul*, his alone without the Church Excommunicated *Hymeneus*? *Paul* saith that *Timothy* received the gift of God, by his laying on him hands, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Ergo, By the laying on of his hands onely, and not of the Whole Presbytery?* It followeth not, the contrary is, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 3. *Delivering to Satan*, v. 5. is all one *with purging out*, *v.* 7. as is cleare by the Illation. *I have decreed, though absent, to deliver such a one to Satan.* Hence his consequence, *v.* 7. ἐκκαθάρατε οὖν, *Purge out therefore.* 2. To *deliver to Satan*, is either all one with *judgeing those that are within*, v. 12. And so with judging this man, and with *putting of him out*, v. 13. or it is not all one; if these be all one, then hath the Church a hand in this delivering to *Satan*, and so it is not a miraculous killing. *Erastus* granteth the consequence, if these be not all one, this is two judgings of the man, one of *Pauls v.* 5. by miraculous killing, and another of *Pauls* and the Church, *v.* 12. This latter must be some Church judgeing of those *that are within the Church*, common to *Paul* and the *Corinthians*, as the words cleare, and which is opposed to *Gods judging of those that are without*; and this is so like Excommunication, that *Erastus* must make some other thing of it. Now we cannot say that there was any miraculous judging of this man, common to *Paul* as an Apostle, and to the *Corinthians*, the ordinary beleevers and Saints, as *Erastus* yeeldeth. 3. ἐξαιρεῖν *to put away the man*, which is expresly commanded to the Church of *Corinth*, *v.* 13. must be the same ἐξαιρεῖν and *putting away*, ἐκ μέσου, in the same word ἵνα ἐξαρθῇ, that is, *v.* 2. But that taking out of the midst of them is a miraculous killing of the man, as *Erastus* saith, now this cannot be, for then the people must be joyned in the same

ἐξαιρεῖν ἐκ μέσου, Est interficere. P. 47.

ſame work of miraculous killing with the Apoſtle *Paul*; now both we and *Eraſtus* muſt diſclaim this; *Ergo*, there muſt be ſome common Church caſting out, common to both.

Eraſtus. *To put away out of the midſt of them, is not to debar from the Sacraments, but to kill; if it were but to extrude the man out of the ſociety of the faithfull, what need was there of publick mourning? and if he had been to be caſt out amongſt the heathen, how could the ſpirit be ſaved? as is ſaid, for without the Church there is no ſalvation.*

Anſ. To put away out of the midſt of them, is to put the man out of the Congregation, as the word *Careh* is expounded before, and is not to kill: were *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* delivered to *Satan*, that they might learn not to blaſpheme? what learning or Diſcipline can dead men be capable of? 2. There's need of mourning when any is cut off from Chriſts body, it being the higheſt judgement of God on earth. 3. Without the viſible Church altogether as Heathens are, there is no ſalvation; But to be ſo without the Church, as the caſting out is a medicinall puniſhment, *That the ſoul may be ſaved in the day of the Lord*, is a mean to bring the ſoul in, to both the inviſible and viſible Church, and putteth none in that ſtate, that they cannot be ſaved, but by the contrary in a way to be ſaved; ſo the man *periret, niſi periret.*

Eraſtus. *It would ſeem, it may be proved from the Text, that the man perſevered not in that wickedneſſe, for the Text ſaith,* ποιήσας τοῦδὲ & τοῦδὲ κατεργασαμένος: *He that hath done, and that hath wrought this deed, not he that doth this deed; and therefore it ſeems* Paul *would inflict puniſhment as a good Magiſtrate uſeth to do (even though the man repent) and he ſaith, that his ſpirit may be ſaved, then the man repented.* In Theſ. 48.

Anſ. 1. Reconcile theſe two (*Paul was as a good Magiſtrate to kill the man, though he ſhould repent*) and (*yet at their interceſſion* (ſaith *Eraſtus*) *he did forgive him*;) durſt *Paul* at the requeſt of men, pardon a Malefactor contrary to the duty of a good Magiſtrate? 2. Can *Paul* intend, in miraculous killing, only the ſaving of the mans ſoul, and knowing that he was ſaved, and having obtained his end, yet he will uſe the mean, that is, he will kill him? or if he intended another end alſo, that others might fear, how could he not kill for this end? A good Magiſtrates zeal ſhould not

not be softned and blunted, for the request of men.

Erastus he saith, *He decreed to deliver the man to* Satan, *for the destruction of the flesh, that the soul may be saved; now* παραδοῦναι *is to give over, to permit; here a person given, a person to whom, a person giving, to wit,* Paul, *and the end; wherefore, that the spirit may be saved; it is, as if I would give my son to a Master, either to be instructed, or chastised, so* 1 Tim. 1. Act. 27. 28. Matth. 5. 18. Matth. 24. παραδώσουν ὑμας εἰς θλῖψιν, Mar. 15. *The brother shall deliver the brother to death, and the Lord saith to* Satan, *behold,* παραδίδομαι, *I give him to thee, this is to deliver one afflicted, killed, condemned.*

Ans. All this is needlesse; to *be delivered over*, is to be recommended and taken in a good sense also, Act. 14. 26. *Commended to the grace of God,* Act. 15. 40. παραδοθεις τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ. and we deny not but *to be delivered to* Satan, is to be delivered to be afflicted; but the question is, what affliction is meant here; the affliction of the flesh say we, or of the unrenewed part, opposed to a saved spirit.

To be delivered to *Satan.*

Pag. 218. The destruction of the flesh.

Erastus. It is unpossible that the Word ὀλεθρος *destruction, can be shown to signifie the destruction of the desires of sinfull flesh in all the New-Testament, it alwayes signifieth killing, death, destruction; nor doth the thing it self compell us to take it otherwayes here, nor for killing and death, as* 1 Thes. 5. *It is true* θανατόω Rom. 8. νεκρόω σαρκόω *to kill, destroy, crucifie, are so taken, but never* ὄλεθρον or ὀλοθρεύω *in either sacred or prophane Authors.*

Chrysostom. Homil. 15. *in* 1 *Cor.*

Ans. I conceive *Chrysostom* knew Greek better then *Erastus*; the man was delivered to *Satan*, ἵνα μαστίξη αὐτὸν ἕλκει πονήρῳ ἢ νόσῳ ἑτέρᾳ. *That he might scourge him (as he did Job) with a hurtfull boyle or some other sickness.* Hence as that learned and judicious Divine, who hath deserved excellently of the Protestant Churches, *Petrus Molineus* saith on the place, *Chrysostom, Homo Graece eloquentiæ Rarum exemplum; A rare example of Grecian eloquence,* doth think per ὀλεθρον *by the Word destruction, not death, but some heavy torment to be meant*; And I am sure *Hieronymus*, a man in the tongues incomparably skilled said, *by destruction here, was meant jejunia & ægrotationes, fasting and diseases*: 2. Nor need we contend for ὀλεθρος, which in all Authors of the world, signifieth destruction, for ὀλυμι is to destroy; the question will rather be, what

Pet. Molineus *In suo vate opusculo eruditissimo.* lib. 2. cap. 11. pag. 108.

Hyeronymus in cap. 5. *ad Galat.*

what is meant by the fleſh, but certainly it is in prophane Greek Authors as unuſuall (I except ſacred Greek Authors, ſuch as *Baſil, Chryſoſtom*, who knew what mortification meant) to ſpeak as *Paul* doth, *Rom.*8.13. *If ye mortifie the deeds of the fleſh, ye ſhall live*: Let *Eraſtus* finde me a parallel to that in the *New Teſtament*, εἰ τὰς πράξεις τῦ σώματος θανατῶτε· I think *Eraſtus* may not deny that this is to mortifie the ſinfull works of the body of ſin, yet *Ariſtotle, Plato, Lucian, Plutarch, Heſiod, Homer*, nor any prophane Greek Author ever ſpake ſo: We ſhall therefore deny that ὄλεθρος ſignifieth never to Greek Authors any thing but bodily death: for 2 *Theſſ.*1.9. ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος everlaſting deſtruction, is ſome more then bodily deſtruction. 3. We ſay it is unpoſſible that ὄλεθρος can be ſhowen to ſignifie in either Old or New Teſtament, a miraculous deſtroying of the body by Satan, we retort this reaſon back upon *Eraſtus*, his Expoſition is not tollerable, becauſe it wanteth a parallel place, it is his own reaſon.

Eraſtus. The deſtruction of the fleſh muſt be the deſtruction of the body, not of concupiſcence, becauſe he addeth that the ſpirit πνεῦμα *may be ſaved, here the ſoul is oppoſed to the body.*

Anſ. Though we ſhould grant, that by the fleſh is meant the body, yet it followeth not, it is the miraculous killing of the man, as I obſerved before. 2. It maketh nothing againſt Excommunication; for many learned Proteſtants teach, that though *to deliver to Satan* were a bodily puniſhment or conjoyned therewith, as the Learned *Anto. Waleus* doth obſerve; yet the Apoſtle is clear for Excommunication in this chapter; & the learned *Molineus* denyeth delivering to *Satan* to be expounded of Excommunication, and will have the deſtruction of the fleſh to be ſome bodily tormenting of his body by *Satan*, & ſo doth ſundry of the Fathers, eſpecially *Ambroſe, Hyeronimus, Auguſtinus*, and *Chryſoſtom*; though *Auguſtine* be doubtful. Yet *Molineus* ſaith, *Certum eſt paulum velle hunc inceſtum moveri communione Eccleſia: ſed id vult fieri ab ipſa Eccleſia Corynthiacâ, dicens*, ver.13. *Tollite iſtum ſceleratum è medio veſtrum*: And that grave and judicious Divine *Piſcator* ſaith, on the place; *That the forme of Excommunication is this delivering to Satan*: but the deſtruction of the fleſh, he thinketh to be the exhauſting of the naturall ſtrength of the body with ſorrow for his ſin, according to that *Prov.*17.22. *A broken heart dryeth the bones*: And therefore it

Waleus de diſcr. Magiſt. pol. to.2. Arg. 6.fol.10. *In vate.*l.2. cap.11.p. 111,112. *Ambroſius* lib. 1. *de penitentia. Hyeronymus* in c.5. ad Galar. *Auguſti.*l. 6. *de ſerm. domi* in *Mont.* cap. 38. *Chryſoſtom hom.* 15. in 1 *Cor. Molineus loc cit. Piſcator* 1 Cor.5. *Zanchius* com. in 2 *Theſſ.*3. citeth theſe words. 1 *Cor.*5.3.4, 5. for Excommunication.

it is to be observed that craftily, *Erastus* insisteth most on those points and syllables of a Text, whereon all Divines, Ancient and Modern do place least strength for Excommunication; I might therefore passe all *Erastus* his force against Excommunication in these, and he shall be not a whit nearer his point. 2. But I shall follow him; when σαρξ *the flesh*, and πνεῦμα the spirit are put together, I see no reason that the one should signifie the body, the other the soul: I know the contrary to be, *Rom.*8.1. *Those that walketh* κατὰ σάρκα *after the inordinate affections, and lusts of the flesh*, are opposed to those that walk, κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα *after the Spirit*, and *Gal.*5.17. the flesh, (ἡ σαρξ) *lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit* (τὸ δὲ πνευμα) *against the flesh*, *Joh.* 3.6. *That which is born of the flesh*, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς *is flesh*, it is not that which is born of the body as body, *and that which is born* ἐκ τὸ πνεύματος *of the Spirit is Spirit*, so *Rom.* 8.9.13,14. *Erastus* should have shewed us such places wherein σαρξ and πνευμα the *flesh* and the *Spirit* signifieth the body and the soul, when the matter of salvation is spoken of as here, *That the Spirit may be saved*, ver.5. then σαρξ *the flesh* is for the most part, if not alwayes, taken in an evil part, for the corruption of mans nature.

Erastus. *How could they desire the Apostle not to deliver him to Satan, that he might* (as *Beza* expoundeth it) *destroy his flesh, that is, bring him to repentance? How could* Paul *assent to such a Petition? How could the Apostle write that he did forgive him? Did* Paul *by forgiving him, permit him not to mortifie and destroy his flesh, and sinfull lusts?*

Ans. Let *Erastus* answer, *How could the Corinthians beseech* Paul *not to kill him, that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord?* How could Paul grant such a Petition, *as that the man should not be saved in the day of the Lord? How could* Paul *by pardoning the man, permit, that he should not be saved in the day of the Lord?* for the saving of the mans soul, is no lesse a fruit of this delivering to Satan, then is the destroying of the lusts of the flesh. 2. They might well desire that upon the mans repentance *Paul* would take a milder way and course to effectuate these two desirable ends, the mortification of his lust, and the saving of his soul, then the last and most dreadfull remedy, which is the censure of Excommunication. 3. The destruction of the lusts of the flesh is a Scripturall

remedy

remedy for saving of the soul in the day of Christ, at is clear, *Rom.* 7.7,8,9,10. *Gal.*5.24,25. But whether miraculous killing be such a mean ordained of God is the question, and ought to be proved by some word of God, beside this place in controversie.

Erastus. *These words, that the soul may be saved in the day of the Lord, do hold forth, that the miserable man was presently to die.* Thes. 59. pag. 49.

Ans. That they hold forth no such thing, is evidently proved, for how were they to cast him out and judge him? And how was *Paul* to pardon him, and they and *Paul* to confirme their love? 2. When *Peter* saith, 1 *Pet.*1.7. *That your faith may be found unto praise, honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ?* were all these presently? Because *Paul* and the faithfull Philippians *were waiting for their Saviours second coming, who should change their vilde bodies,* were they to die presently? When *Paul* prayeth, *that Onesiphorus may finde mercy in that day,* 2 *Tim.*1. 18. I pray you, will it follow that *Onesiphorus* was presently to die?

Erastus. *The word ἐπιτιμία rebuke, doth not signifie rejecting from the Sacraments;* 1. *Rejecting from the Sacraments is never put for punishment in Scripture.* 2. *It is but a rebuke inflicted by many;* and Paul, 2 *Cor.*2. *absolveth him from this as a sufficient punishment, a rebuke is no punishment.* Thes. 59. 49.

*Ans.*1. To be debarred from the society of the faithfull, as *Hagar* was, as *Cain* was; as *David* was, *Cast out of the Lords inheritance by Saul*; yea, to be rebuked, *Ezech.* 3.25,26. are evils, but they are not evils of sin; *Ergo,* He speaks not like a Divine, who will not have them punishments; if to injoy the Sanctuary, Church, *holy things of God,* and the society of the Saints be a rich, blessing of God, as the Scripture saith it is, *Psal.*42.4. *Psal.*27.4. *Psal.*84.10. *Psal,*110.3. *Psal.*63.1,2,3. *Cant.*1.7.8. *Cant.*2.16.17. *Cant.*5.1. *Cant.*6.1,2,3. *Rev.*2.1. and to deny this be a symtome of prophanity, then to be separated from these as a Heathen, must be to the children of God, the greatest evil of punishment and matter of sorrow on earth, it smelleth not of piety to deny this.

Erastus. *If the man was only rebuked; How was he to be delivered to Satan to be tormented and killed? Some Ancients answer, he was but delivered to Satan to be afflicted in his body with sickness, and at length delivered by* Paul, *others say more congruously to the minde of Paul; that* Paul *purposed not by himself to deliver the man to Satan, but to do it, with the Church congregated together, and* Thes. 60. Page 50.

When the Church saw him swallowed up with griefe, they deferred while they tryed Pauls *minde, and obtained pardon to him, and in the meane time threatned him, if he should not repent; and obtained at length, that* Paul *should pardon him. Anſ.* Many learned Divines hold the former, yet ſo as they conclude Excommunication out of this Chapter; of this I ſay no more. But *Eraſtus* hath a way of his own. To which I ſay, 1. There is no Scripture, but this controverted one to warrant that the Apoſtles who had the gift of Miracles, 1. Suſpended the working of Miracles, either on the prayers, or free conſent of the whole multitude of beleevers. 2. That the execution of a miraculous work, was committed to Deputies and ſubſtitutes under *Paul*, who had it in their power miraculouſly to kill him, or in their free will and Chriſtian compaſſion, to ſuſpend the miracle, and not kill. 3. That the Apoſtles in acts of miraculous juſtice, ſought adviſe of any, or might be broken by requeſts, to deſiſt from miracles as they ſaw the party repent, or not repent, or friends intercede, or not intercede. 4. So many circumſtances of the Text, laying a command on the Church of *Corinth*, to put him out and judge him, and yet the matter remaine a miracle. Theſe to me are riddles, if God had told us ſuch a Hiſtory, I could have beleeved it; but to gather theſe by uncertaine conjectures. without any ground of other Scriptures, is a thing I can hardly beleeve. But ſince Excommunication is an ordinary cenſure, the Church might well, as they ſee the man penitent, or contumacious, caſt him out, or not, pardon, or not pardon.

Eraſtus. Paul *delivered to Satan* Hymeneus *and* Alexander, *that they might learne not to blaſpheme, not that the dead are capable to learne, or to be blaſphemed; but this he ſaith as a Magiſtrate, when he ſaith he will give an ill doer to the hangman, that he may learn to ſteale no more, and to rob no more.*

Page 221. *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* not killed by Satan.

Anſ. 1 Tim. 1. 20. *I delivered them to Satan,* ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν. It is like to edifying diſcipline, and agreeable to *Pauls* uſe of the rod of diſcipline, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. *Though I ſhould boaſt ſomewhat more of our authoritie, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for deſtruction.* Now it were ſafer to give a ſenſe congruous to the intrinſecall end of diſcipline, which was not for deſtruction of the body, but for the edifying of ſouls. 2. Yea,

ſo

so *Paul* had no lesse the Sword, then the rod of the Word, *Nero* had not so heavy a sword, as miraculous killing: Should not *Paul* speake rather as a Pastor of Christ, then as a bloody Magistrate?

Erastus. *If to deliver to Satan, be all one with debarring from the Supper onely, yet it is not all one, with being cast out of the Church, without which there is no salvation, but the Supper is not absolutely necessary to Salvation.* Page 223.

Ans. Nor doe we put that necessity on the Sacraments, but where the man is excluded from the Sacraments, for such a sinne as if he repent not, he is excluded from Salvation; it concerneth him much to thinke it a weighty judgement to be excluded from the Seales.

Erastus. *These two are inconsistent which you teach, to wit, that he is not debarred from the Sacraments, who desireth them, and that his desire whether it be a right, or a wrong and unlawfull desire, shall depend on the judgement of others, to wit, the Presbytery.* Page 223.

Ans. Erastus should have made others see how these two fights together, I see no inconsistencie, no more then to say a childe that desireth food is not debarred from food, and yet his desire of food may be subject to wise Stewards, whether every desire of food be right or no, as whether he should be answered by the Stewards, when he desireth poyson or bread, not to eate, but to cast to dogs; and this will fight against preaching of the Word, the Professor that longeth for the comforts of the promises of the Gospel is not debarred from them, yet are preachers to try whether threatnings be not fitter for him in his security, then the comforts of the promises.

Erastus. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 12. and 13. *threatneth not exclusion from the Lords Supper, to those who had not repented of their schisme, drunkennesse, denying of the resurrection, but he saith he would severely punish them according to the authority and power given him of God, and he did this frequently, but we read not of exclusion from the sacraments.* Page 224.

Answ. 1. It is true, he threatneth those who had not repented *of their uncleannesse, and fornication, and lasciviousnesse*, 2. Cor. 12. 20, 21. and c. 13. v. 2. threatneth that he *will not spare, but use his authority*, but doth *Erastus* read that he either threatneth, or doth actuall

actually, miraculously kill any of the beleevers at *Corinth* ? and let him answer why the Apostle did not write to the Church, that they would conveene, and take course with them, as he did with the incestuous man, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. when he saith, *He will not spare when he comes*, he must be expounded according to *Erastus*, to come as a miraculous Magistrate to kill them. 3. He saith not they were impenitent, but he feareth it should be so. 4. We hold if any should be contumacious, he would not onely deny pearls to such Swine, as his Master commanded, *Mat.* 7. But also follow that rule, *Mat.* 18. 4. *Erastus* himselfe granteth, if there shall be found a man that tramples upon the *Pearles and holy things of God*, as there must be some one or other, which is such as deserveth to be miraculously killed: By this Argument he granteth (I say) that such a one should not be admitted. *Hunc ego minimè admittendum censeo*, but how shall he be not admitted by this Argument ?

Page 207.

Page 223. 224. Erastus. *There were many amongst the Ancients who deferred their Baptisme to the end of their life, when therefore it is not written, that these are damned, who are excluded from the Supper, against their will, and not those who willingly exclude themselves from Baptisme, why should the one more then the other be delivered to Satan? for he is in a better condition, who is excluded by the Presbyters against his will from the Supper, then he who doth of his owne free will exclude himselfe from Baptisme.*

Ans. That the Ancients in the Apostolique Church, which is our rule, did deferre baptisme till they died, *Erastus* cannot prove, the Ancients after them is not our rule. 2. That these were admitted to the Supper, a Sacrament of the nourishment of these in whom Christ liveth, before they were baptized, which is the Sacrament of Regeneration, and our first birth, cannot be defended by *Erastus*, and so he argues from an unlawfull practise. 3. We teach not that any is damned, because he is excluded from the Supper, that Exclusion is a punishment; men are damned for sins, not for meer punishments, but his sin is bound in heaven, because of a great scandall; such as incest, and that, if he repent not, is the cause of damnation: and therefore *Erastus* should have compared sinne with sinne, the scandall with sinfull refusing of Baptisme, and not have made a halting and lame comparison, an argument that concludeth nothing. 4. Though those who

who deferred baptiſme till death, ſhould not have been delivered to Satan, yet will *Eraſtus* ſay, they ſhould not have been otherwiſe cenſured? for theſe behooved with *Socinians* to hold Baptiſme but an indifferent rite, and by this many lived in the contempt of a neceſſary ordinance, (though not ſimply neceſſary) and ſo died with the ſinfull want of Baptiſme many times.

Eraſtus. The excluſion of men from the Sacraments did creep into the Church When men did aſcribe ſalvation to the Sacraments, therefore the Supper was given to dying men, though excommunicate; as the deniall of the Supper damneth, Ergo, *the receiving of it ſaveth. And ſo of Baptiſme they reaſoned.*

Anſw. *Eraſtus* nameth this his own probable conjecture. But it is to beg the queſtion, he may know how ſingular *Auguſtine* was for the neceſſity of *Baptiſme*, and how many of the *Ancients* were againſt him in it. 2. He may know this conſequence to be a conjecture, and that it is not ſtronger, becauſe it is his owne. 3. He granteth that excluſion of the unworthy from the Sacraments is ancient, ſo much gain we by his conjectures.

Eraſtus. *When the Church wanted a Magiſtrate and the ſword,* Paul *commanded that the* Corinthians *might obtain by their prayers, that the inceſtuous man might be put from amongſt them, that is, that he might be killed; if he command not that the man be killed, but caſt out of the Church only, he ſhould ſay as much as if one ſhould bid preſerve the chaſtity of a Virgin by caſting her out of the ſociety of chaſte matrons, into a bordell-houſe; and* Paul *biddeth not the* Corinthians *deliver the man to* Sathan; *but only that they would convene, that he might, as preſent in Spirit, deliver him to* Sathan; *and that they would deliver him to* Sathan, *and put him out of the midſt of them, by prayers and mourning: for in my corrected Theſis, I ſaid, that this, put away evill out of the midſt of you,* Deut. 13. *was in ſillabs* Deut. 17. & 19 & 21. 22. *ter.* & c. 24. *once, and* ἐξαρετε *is in them all.* Page 227. 228. 229.

Anſw. 1. That the Church wanted the ſword is no wonder; the Church as the Church, hath no ſuch carnall weapons as the Sword, and that *Peter* in killing *Ananias* and *Saphira*, and *Paul* in ſtriking *Elymas* with blindneſſe, did ſupply the place of a *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* which the Church then wanted, ſo as it was the *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* his place, if there had been any to ſtrike *Ananias* and *Saphyra* with ſudden death. I doe not beleeve upon

Eraſtus

Eraſtus his word, becauſe I finde *Nadab* and *Abihu* killed immediately by the Lord from heaven with fire, *Lev.* 10. 1. and at that time when there was *Moſes* and ordinary Magiſtrates to have killed them, and God immediately cauſed the earth to open her mouth and ſwallow up quick *Corah* and his company, and yet there was a *Magiſtrate* to doe juſtice on them, for their treaſonable conſpiracie; and I ſee not how this may not warrant Miniſters, when either heathen or Tyrannous *Magiſtrates* refuſe to uſe the ſword, to fall to as Paſtors, and in an extraordinary manner uſe the ſword againſt murtherers in the viſible Church. It is true, *Peters* miraculous killing of *Ananias*, may poſſibly hold forth the duty analogically of puniſhing ill doers in a *Magiſtrate*, where he is a Chriſtian member of the Church. But it is a conjecture without Scripture, that here *Paul* doth call the *Corinthians* in to come and be coactors with him by their prayers in a particular miracle which was never wrought, for *Eraſtus* granteth he was never killed. 1. *Paul* reprehendeth their not mourning, *v.* 2. *And you are puffed up, and have not rather* κ) οὐχὶ μᾶλλον *mourned.* This was an ordinary, Chriſtian, not a miraculous duty, which they ſhould have performed as a Church, though he ſhould not have written to them. Let *Eraſtus* cleare how *Paul* chideth them, for want of an habituall Faith of Miracles, and of a ſorrow proportioned thereunto. 2. That *Gal.* 5. 12. ὄφελον κ), *Would God they were cut off that trouble you*; if this was in *Pauls* power, by a miracle to cut off the falſe Apoſtles, how could *Paul* wiſh to doe a Miracle and did it not? 2. If he wiſhed theſe ſhould be cut off by the *Galathians*, then as *Beza de Presbyt.* page 82. ſaith, It was in the *Galathians* power ſo to doe; and why ſhould not they have prayed miraculouſly for the deſtruction of ſuch? 3. In all the word, to *deliver to Satan, is never to kill by Satan*; as *Beza* ſaith, and *Eraſtus* can anſwer nothing to it. 4. That *Paul* here tooke the Magiſtrates Sword, becauſe the *Magiſtrate* was a Heathen. 5. That the Church, when a *Magiſtrate* doth not his duty, is to pray, that God would by ſome miraculous and immediate providence, ſupply the *Magiſtrates* place. 6. That *Paul* doth rebuke the *Corinthians*, not for the omiſſion of an ordinary duty, and the want of an ordinary faith, but becauſe of the want of extraordinary ſorrow, and of the faith of Miracles, in

Delivering to Satan not miraculous.

old

old and young, and women who could pray for the miraculous killing of this man, all theſe look beſide the Text, for *ver.*2. he ſaith ſuch a hainous ſin is committed, and ye *are puffed up*, πεφυσιωμένοι *blowen up*, and *have not rather* ἐπενθήσατε *mourned:* this is the defect of an ordinary grace, and hardneſſe and ſecurity that *Paul* rebuketh in them, as the firſt word ſignifieth, 1 *Cor.*8.1. ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ *knowledge puffeth up*, 1 *Cor.*13.4. *Love* οὐ φυσιοῦται *is not blown up*, 1 *Cor.*4.6. 1 *Cor.*4.18. *Col.*2.18. and the other word ſignifieth ordinary ſorrow, *Mat.*5.4 *Bleſſed are they that mourn*, οἱ πενθοῦντες, *Luk.* 6.25. 2 *Cor.*12.21. *Jam.*4.9. *Mat.*9.15. There is not one word of praying by the faith of miracles in the Text (for ſuch a faith is required to ſuch a prayer) that God would miraculouſly deſtroy the man, or that *Paul* rebuked them for not praying in this miraculous faith: it is the way of *Eraſtus* to obtrude Expoſitions on the Scripture, ſo unknown and violent, as they are darker and harder to be beleeved then the Text. 5. The Apoſtle commandeth them to put out the man ἐξαιρεῖν, that is, to kill him: What killing is this? to pray to God that *Paul* miraculouſly may put him out, and kill him, give us any word of God, that ἐξαιρεῖν in the Old or New Teſtament ſignifieth any ſuch thing, there is not one word of Prayer in the Text: 6. They were to conveen, not ſimply, as Chriſtians, to pray, but with the *vertue of his ſpirit, as preſent in minde, but abſent in body*; this muſt put ſome more in them then a mourning ſpirit, for the want of which he rebuked them; it is as much as he and they together were to joyn in puttiug out the man and judging him, as he ſpeaketh, *ver.*12.7. Nor is this all one, *as to put a Woman out of the company of chaſte Matrons to the bordel houſe to keep her chaſtity*, no more then the wiſdom of God in *Paul* doth, *Rom.*16.17. 2 *Theſſ.*3.14.15. put unordinate walkers out of the ſociety of thoſe who walk according to the truth of the Goſpel, that they may preſerve their ſound walking, eſpecially when excluſion from the godly cauſeth ſhame, and ſo humiliation, and this reaſon is againſt Gods wiſdom, as much as againſt us: 8. That *to put away evil*, ἐξαιρεῖν, *Deut.*17. and 19. and 21. and 22. is to kill, is not denied, and that in divers places, but not to pray that evil may be miraculouſly put away, as *Eraſtus* ſaith: But we are to ſee, whether כרת in the Hebrew (of which Language *Eraſtus* profeſſeth his ignorance) ſignifie that alwayes: The contrary I have already

ἐξαιρεῖν, to put away not always to kill.

ſhown, the learned *Pagnine* and *Mercer* ſay the contrary, that it ſignifieth, to cut, devide, or ſtrike a Covenant, *Gen.*15.18. *Deut.* 19.5. *Jer.*34.8. *Eſa.*55.3. and Maſter *Leigh* in his late *Critica Sacra* on the Old Teſtament, ſaith, it ſignifieth *to ſtay, to cut off by death, by baniſhment, or any other way, whereby a thing in uſe before, afterward ceaſeth*, Joel.1.8. Amos 1.5. Yea, to cut off by divorce, as I noted before, and *Exod.*12.15. To cut off from *Iſrael*, is expounded, *ver.*19. to cut off from the Church of *Iſrael*: Yea, the Law forbiddeth that not only in the time of the Paſſeover, they ſhould not eat leaven, but it ſhould not be in their houſes; Now muſt they be killed, if it was found in their houſes, beſide their knowledge? ſee *Deut.*16.3. *Exod.* 13.7. What *Eraſtus* ſaith to the end of the Chapter; is but repeated reaſons before anſwered.

Leigh in *Critica Sacra*, pag. 245.

CHAP. X. Queſt. 6.

Arguments for Excommunication, from 1 Corinthians 5. *vindicated.*

REverend *Beza* ſaid, *The World is the Kingdom of Satan, and he that is delivered to Satan, is caſt out of Chriſts Kingdom to Satans Kingdom.*

Lib.3.cap. 5. p.233.

Eraſtus ſaith, *Is it not eaſier to heal them by remaining in the Church, having the Magiſtrate to compell them to their duty, then to caſt them out of the Church? The World is a kingdom of Wickedneſſe and impiety, may you not more eaſily reforme a Wanton and laſcivious virgin within the houſe, then by caſting her out of the houſe into a Bordel? Will not ſlaves of* Satan *be more eaſily healed amongſt the children of God, then amongſt Wicked men?*

Anſ. Whether, *to be delivered to Satan*, be to be put formally in his power, that he may vex the ſpirit, that the man may be humbled for ſin, or if it be to be given to *Satan* only, *conſequenter*, and caſt out of the Church, that is, Chriſts office-houſe of Grace, to live as the world, of which *Satan is God and Prince*, 2 *Cor.*4.4. *Joh.*12.31. *Ioh.*14.30. It is not much to be diſputed: But this reaſon is againſt the wiſdom of God, who hath appointed that the ſhame,

shame, grief and sorrow of being put out of Christs family, should exceedingly humble the spirit of any in whom there is any thing of God. To eschew the scandalous a mean to save them.

And *Erastus* might as well say to Paul, *Why dost thou command the Saints not to eat and drink with those that are called brethren, and yet are fornicators, covetous, extortioners,* 1 *Cor.*4.11. *and such as cause divisions and walk inordinately, as* Rom. 16. 17. 2 *Thes.*3. 14,15. *and to withdraw from their company? they must then converse only with the slaves of Satan, and the wicked of the world, when they are deprived of the society of the godly, and that is the way to loose them; were it not better to command the just contrary, that the godly should eat, drink and converse with inordinate walkers? for they may turn them from their evil way; for will an unchaste virgin be made chaste by being cast out of her fathers house into a Bordel-house? Will not slaves of* Satan *rather be healed amongst the children of God, then amongst the wicked?*

But *Erastus* seeth not, that Gods aime in this separation, is not only, that the cast out man *may be ashamed,* 2 *Thes.*3.14,15. and so humbled and brought to repentance, when he findeth he is deprived of the blessings of the Saints, of their society, Ordinances: But also God hath a higher aime, to the end, the whole lump of Christs body, be not leavened and infected with the contagion of one man, 1 *Cor.*4.6,7. *Gal.*5.9.10.

Erastus. *The similitude of a rotten Member, proveth nothing: for* 1. *There be no such sinners desperately uncurable, of whom there is no hope so long as they live, except pertinacious Hereticks erring in the foundation of salvation, and such as sin against the holy Ghost:* 2. *It is not necessary that men using reason and free will, be defiled and corrupted by other sinners, as the whole Member is by the rotten Member; for as a Tree cannot but be burnt by the fire that seaseth on it, so neither can the Members continuated by touching, escape corruption.* 3. *None can be cast out of the Church into the world, as it is the kingdom of Satan, for if they keep the faith, though they were amongst Turks, they are not in the world, that is, in the Kingdom of Satan, nor in the world:* 4. Paul *would not have him cast out into the world, that his soul may be saved, for this were to make the weak dispair, and make them hypocrites.* Lib.3.c.5. pag.234. The similitude of a cut off member to hold forth Excommunication vindicated.

Ans. This similitude is the holy Ghosts in the very sense we use it,

it, 2 *Tim.* 2. 17. *Their Word ſhall eat as a canker,* a Metaphor (as *Calvin, Piſcator, Marlorate* obſerve) *from a rotten member that corrupteth the whole body,* and to ſay, *becauſe a man hath reaſon and ſo free-Will, that he will not be corrupted;* whereas the whole member by neceſſity of nature cannot but be corrupted by a rotten member, is to ſpeak not like a Divine, but as *Pelagius* ſpeaketh; for except we uſe the remedy appointed of God, to eſchew the contagion of the wicked, and eſchew their company, as we are commanded, and as the godly have done, and the wicked have not done, and therefore have been infected with the way of other evil men, *Prov.* 22. 24. *Prov.* 5. 8, 9. *Pſa.* 26. 4, 5. *Eſa.* 2. 6, 7. *Pſa.* 119. 63. *Pſa.* 139. 21, 22. *Rev.* 18. 4. 2 *Chro.* 19. 2. (though we ſhould not actually be corrupted) yet we ſin and tempt the Lord, in that we ſeek a temptation to our ſelves; yea, as all the reaſons of *Eraſtus* are naturall and againſt the wiſdom of God in his Ordinances, ſo expreſly this; God forbiddeth his people to marry with the Canaanites, or to make Covenants with them, *Exod.* 34. 12, &c. *Becauſe* (ſaith the Lord) *they will inſnare thee, and draw away thy heart after their Gods*: May not *Eraſtus* ſay, *But men have reaſon and free-will not to conſent to the inticing counſels of the Canaanites, though they be joyned in Covenant, and marriage with them*: *Preterea non eſt neceſſe ſic alios a malis contaminari.* 3. It is good, that *Eraſtus* granteth, that pertinacious *Hereticks*, becauſe uncurable, may infect others, for ſo the word expreſly ſaith, what ſhall be done with them? *Eraſtus* granteth they be rotten members: *Ergo*, either they muſt, by Excommunication be ſeparated from the body, as we teach, or the body muſt ſeperate from them; if this latter be ſaid, all that *Eraſtus* inferreth againſt us, ſhall fall againſt himſelf: 1. We ſhall not need to be infected with the Hereſie of ſuch: *Utimur ratione, We have the Armour of reaſon and free Will, againſt this rotten and rotting member,* ſaith *Eraſtus*: 2. We ſhall expoſe *Hereticks* to the *Kingdom of Satan,* and the world, by which they ſhall be hardned in their pernicious *Hereſies*: Beſide 3. We make them Hypocrites: 4. I ſee no warrant *Eraſtus* hath to ſay, *That Hereticks erring in fundamentals are more contagious and rotten members then ſlaves of Satan, failing againſt the ſecond Table*: 5. *He that is caſt out of the Church, though amongſt the Turkes, is in the World, but not of the World*: If he keep the faith, and if he do ſo, he ſhall re-

repent and come home to Christs visible Kingdom, but because he keepeth the faith, yet he is not a member of a visible Church, except he professe it, and repent; for even the sound in faith, if obstinate in Scandals, may deserve Excommunication. 6. There is nothing said against Excommunication in the two last Reasons, but what striketh against *Timothy* his publike rebuking, and threatning wrath against those that sin openly, for they may through their owne corruption, so farre abuse publike threatnings, as they may be led on despaire and hypocrisie. Now *Erastus* as we shall hear, granteth those are to be rebuked openly, who sin openly. 7. We say not *to deliver to Satan any man, is to deliver him to the World*, but to cast him out of the Church, that *consequenter* he may be left to the World; but that he should sinne, and be led away with the World, is neither the intrinsecall end of *Excommunication*, or of the Church, but an event or end by accident: the intrinsecall end is the Salvation of the man.

Beza *saith, that* Paul *speaketh of a spirituall punishment, and not of a corporall.*

Erastus *saith. When* Peter *killed* Ananias *corporally, was not this corporall punishment? When* Paul *gave some to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, and God punisheth our sinnes with temporall death, how shalt you prove that God, and the Apostles punisheth not sinnes with corporall, or politicke punishment?* Page 235.

Ans. The instance of *Peters* killing *Ananias* is in vain brought in: Its but a begging of the question, for it is not said *Peter* delivered *Ananias* to Satan, *that his Spirit might be saved.* Who revealed this secret to *Erastus*, that *Peter* used the Ministery of Satan in killing *Ananias*? We have as good reason to say, *Peter* delivered *Ananias* to a good Angell to be killed, as *Erastus* hath for his dreame. 2. We deny not, but God and the Apostles did punish sinne with corporall punishment, but let him show without the bounds of the place in controversie; (for we must expound Scripture by Scripture) where ever the *Church conveened together in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, did judge and miraculously kill any member of the *Church*, that the *Spirit may be saved in the day of God.* No warran that the Apostles kil. led any by the ministery of Satan.

Beza said, *This killing by the people, would be ground of a great Calumnie, to make many say, Christians did usurpe the Sword of the Magi-*

Magistrate, and that they were not subject to the Magistrate.

Erastus. *We give this power of miraculous killing onely to the Apostles.*

Ans. Yea, But the calumny standeth so long as *Erastus* giveth to all the people the faith of Miracles to conveene and pray that *Paul* might miraculously kill those that offended the Church, and its probable when the enemies objected to Christians, all they could falsely, they would not have omitted this, *that the very people by their prayers meet in one Church-jury, to kill* Cesars *Subjects.* Beza *said, The Christian Magistrate should by this kill all the drunkards, fornicators, and the like with the Sword.*

Pag. 236. 237. *Erastus* answereth, 1. *All faults deserve not killing, but some other punishment of a lower degree.* 2. *The Lord himselfe appointed that the Magistrate should compell men to doe their duty, why then should* Beza *speake against God, and call this a compelling of men to be Hipocrites?*

No miraculous faith required in the *Corinthians* for the killing of the man.

Ans. If other sins, as drunkennesse, fornication, extortion, doe infect the Church, and be scandalous to the very Gentiles, as the Apostle saith of *incest*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. 6, 7. Upon the same reason *Paul* should have rebuked them, because they did not from the faith of Miracles pray that *Paul* might inflict some miraculous judgement by the Ministery of Satan, though lesse then death for other sinnes. But I pray you, *Paul* had either a warrant from God to kill this man, or he had none at all: If he had a warrant, why did he not that which is the part of a miraculous Magistrate without the prayers of the *Corinthians*? Did *Paul* chide them, because they prayed not to God that he might doe his duty? if he had no warrant at all, Why should he chide the *Corinthians*, for that they prayed not that he might doe a duty, which was not his duty? For that is not *Pauls* duty, for the doing whereof he hath no warrant from God; if it was his duty onely conditionally; 1. What warrant is there in Scripture, to say, *Paul* should have miraculously killed the incestuous person, upon condition that the *Corinthians* had by the faith of Miracles, prayed that he might worke that miraculous slaughter, which because they did not, *Paul* was either exonered of that as no duty, or then *Paul* chided them, because they prayed not to prevene *Pauls* sinfull neglect? 2. How was this revealed to the

the *Corinthians*, that they ſhould pray that God by *Paul*, as by his *Magiſtrate* might revenge this inceſt, and not revenge their fronication, coveteouſnes, extortion, Idolatry, eſpecially ſeeing he ſaith that, *v.9. He had written to them in another Epiſtle, not to keep company with ſuch?* Whence I thinke it evident, that *Paul* in another *Epiſtle*, had ordained ſeparation of *Fornicators, Coveteous perſons*, and the like, from amongſt them, and ſo cenſures for all ſcandalous perſons: And how ſhal we believe he would not teach them to caſt out inceſtuous perſons, that are far more ſcandalous? And if ſo, he muſt have written in another Epiſtle of this miracle; that they were to pray he might work: Is it not evident by this, that *Eraſtus* his way, is full of Conjectures and groundleſſe uncertainties. 2. We deny not that the Magiſtrate may compell men to do their duty; nor doth *Beza* deny that: But that the Church hath or had any influence in the blood of an inceſtuous perſon, and in working of miracles for the bodily deſtruction of any, is moſt falſe, and cannot be proved by this Text: Nor do we think that the Church (the weapons of whoſe warfare are carnall) can compell any man by corporall puniſhment, to duties by the Sword; for ſo their Spirituall way, which is terminated on the Conſcience, ſhould lead men to Hypocriſie in profeſſion of the truth, for ſo reaſoneth *Eraſtus*; the Magiſtrate with the Sword rather puniſheth ſins committed in Gods Service, then forceth to duties: The fifth Argument of *Beza* is vindicated already.

Eraſtus. *We ſay not that* Paul *was to deliver the man to Satan, that he may be ſaved, but that* Paul *was to puniſh this high tranſgreſſion with the Sword, to the terror of others; but only he ſet bounds to Satan, that he ſhould only kill his body, but not meddle with his ſoul; but becauſe the man repented*, Paul *hoped well of his ſoul, that his ſoul ſhould be ſaved in the day of Chriſt.* Page 237, 238.

Anſ. 1. Here *Eraſtus* doth more fully reveal the vileneſſe of his opinion, for he granteth the intrinſecall end of this miraculous killing, is not the *Salvation of the mans ſoul, but the revenging of the wickedneſſe of the ſin, for the terror of others*: Which is 1. Contrary to the Text, which ſaith, *He was to be delivered to Satan, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ, that the ſpirit may be ſaved.* This noteth that the intrinſecall end of this delivering to Satan, was the Salvation of the mans ſoul: But the Text ſaith nothing of *Eraſtus* his end, *that others*

thers may be terrified, though that may be an end. It is a wonder to me, that since *Eraſtus* granteth the man repented, even when *Paul* did in this Chapter chide with the *Corinthians*, that they delivered him not to Satan: For *Eraſtus* ſaith, ὁ ποιήσας, *He that hath done this deed*, not he that continueth pertinaciouſly in it (ſaith he:) hence it is clear, that he repented at this time: How doth *Paul* chide them for not delivering a repenting man to the Devil? that his Spirit may be ſaved; if he repented, *his ſpirit was ſaved*; Ergo, *Paul* was in the fault, and chid them without reaſon; if they ſay, though he did repent, yet for example to terrifie others he ſhould have been killed, 2 *Cor.* 2. ſaith, He was not killed; and *Eraſtus* ſaith it; *Ergo*, yet *Paul* failed, and they alſo. 3. It is againſt the intrinſecall end of that power which *Eraſtus* ſaith is miraculous: For *Paul* ſaith the end of that power *is for Edification, not for Deſtruction*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. Now the intrinſecall end of bodily killing, is peace, and terror to others, that they may be afraid to do ſo any more: But the intrinſecall end, and *finis operis*, is not Edification, but *finis operantis* onely, for acts of Magiſtrates are not acts of the firſt Table which kindly, and *per ſe*, regardeth edification, but acts of the ſecond Table, if their ſoules be ſaved who die, for their enormous crimes by the hand of the *Magiſtrate*: It is not from the violent death, as if it were an intrinſecall mean and ordinance appointed of God for converſion: But becauſe God giveth to thoſe who die that way, repentance. Yea, it is no more a mean of ſaving of the ſoule, then if they ſhould die in their beds by ſome diſeaſe.

To the examples of *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, that they were not killed miraculouſly, I anſwered before. *Eraſtus* addeth no new reply to *Beza*.

CHAP. XI. Queſt. 7.

Page 240. 241. *Of the leaven*, 1 *Cor.* 5. Eraſtus *his ſentence in his* l. 3. c. 6. *and* c. 7. *Examined.*

Of the leaven. 1 *Cor.* 5.

ERaſtus. *I ſhall grant* (*ſince* Beza *will have it ſo*) *that* Paul *expoundeth the Ceremony of leaven, in the celebration of the Paſſeover,*

passeover, and that he doth not only allude to it: Paul *compareth the feast of unleavened bread to the pilgrimage of our life in this World, and leaven signifieth Wickednesse*: *Hence as the Iews all the time of the feast might eat no leavened bread, so all our life are vve to leave and forsake the vvorld and journey toward our promised Canaan, We are never to live Wickedly, What can hence be collected? but as he that eat unleavened bread, Was to be killed, so should every Wicked man be killed? He that eat leavened bread in these seven dayes, Was not commanded to be debarred from the Passeover: And the Passeover Was the beginning of this feast, as faith in Christ Was the beginning of our spirituall eating of Christ crucified for us, and of our neW Christian life.*

Ans. I hold that learned *Beza* hath well expounded the *leaven* here; he compareth the scandals of wicked men to leaven, the holinesse of the Saints to *unleavened bread*, and the publick Congregation to the feast of the Passeover, and Excommunication or putting away to the removing of the *leaven*; for a scandalous man corrupteth the whole Church: so the *Jewes* and *Rabbines*, as *Buxtorfius* saith, that the *Rabbins* call naturall concupiscence, יצר הרע. *Rabbi Alexander* said after his Prayer: *Lord, It is knoWn to thee that it is my Will to do thy Will*: *But What retardeth me? the leaven in the masse or lump*, and *Buxtorfius* citeth the same place, 1 *Cor.*5. 6. and *Gal.*5.9. And least we should think that he meant nothing but naturall concupiscense; he saith in the *Targum*, *They take the Word* סיאור *for Wickednesse and folly*; he citeth *Medraseh Koheleth*, cap.7. ver.8. except *R. Samuel, had been long suffering, The Persian that he taught, had returned to folly, or his old Wickednesse.* *Paul* saith the same, *Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a neW lump*: He speaketh to the Church conveened. 2. The comparison runneth so, that the *Corinthians* were to purge out the old leaven of wickednesse, and cast out the incestuous man, that they might be a new lump; and this if it must alwayes be done, far more when they are to celebrate that feast that came in place of the passeover: Nor is the Apostle only Teaching what they could not lawfully do, all their life, as they were single Christians, but what was their duty as *Christians*, συναχθέντες conveened together in a Church way, for *Paul* doth not command one single Christian to cast him out, but he commandeth the Church, *gathered together*

Beza contr. *Erastum de Presbyterie*, Pag.88.

Buxtorfius in Lexico, Rabinco. pag.2303. *in voc.* שאר שאר שבעסה

Buxtorfius in Lex. Rabbi pag.1413.

What it is to purge out the leaven.

in the name of the Lord Ieſus, With Pauls *ſpirit, and the power of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, ver.*4.5. To purge out, not the leaven of ſin in themſelves, but the man, ver.2. *That he that hath done this deed may be put out,* and ver.7. *Purge out the old leaven,* and that the *Apoſtles* precept is to caſt out the man, he ſaith it in expreſſe termes, ver.13. καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, *Caſt out that Wicked man from amongſt you,* and ver.12. They were to judge him, as one *that is Within*: 2. Becauſe without conveening together in their daily converſation, they were to purge the leaven of malice out of their heart, it were a ridiculous thing for *Paul* to command them to convene altogether, to lead a godly life: 3. There was no need that they ſhould convene *With* Pauls *ſpirit, and in the name and power of our Lord* Ieſus *Chriſt to lead a godly life,* and for a perſonall purging of every man his own ſoul from this leaven. 4. They were to judge this man, ver.12. Therefore this cannot be meant of a perſonall judging every one of themſelves, but of a Church-judging of an offender. 5. If *Eraſtus* grant that *Paul* expoundeth the Ceremony of leaven, and putting away leaven in the Paſſeover: Let him ſee how he can apply this to killing of every ſingle man that liveth wickedly: We apply it to the caſting out of the ſcandalous out of the Church, as leaven was to be put out of the houſes of all who were to eat the paſſeover.

None killed for eating leavened bread.

Eraſtus. *I care not much Whither the Lord himſelf immediatly, or the Magiſtrate Was to kill him, Who eat leavened bread at that time: But I rather think that God killed him; for We finde none killed for this cauſe*: 2. *Becauſe* Paul *writ of thoſe Who did unworthily eat,* 1 *Cor.*11.

Anſ. There is no ground that God any way would have them to be killed, that did eat unleavened bread, and that *We finde none for that cauſe ever killed,* is much for us: for then God did not execute any ſuch Law, which (as *Eraſtus* ſaith) *Was broken by many*: It is like God never made any ſuch Law: 2. Becauſe it is ſaid, he ſhall be cut off, who eateth leavened bread, it followeth not that therefore this was done immediately by God; for it is ſaid, *Lev.* 18.29. *Whoſoever doth any of theſe abominations, even the ſoul that committeth them, ſhall be cut off from amongſt the people*; if that be killing; it is known, the Magiſtrate was to kill ſuch as committed inceſt, & did lie with beaſts: But *Vatablus* expoundeth it of Excommunication,

munication, thus, *Id est, Deus non agnoscet illum tanquam Israelitam & circumcisum:* and *Vatablus* understood the Hebrew Tongue better, then *Erastus* who professeth he understandeth nothing of it. 3. That which *Erastus* saith of Paul, *That God himself killed these at Corinth, who did eat and drink unvvorthily*; may as well insinuate the Magistrate should kill with the sword, all that communicateth unworthily (which is absurd) as it can prove, that those that eat leavened bread were immediatly killed of God.

Erastus. *Those that eat leavened bread vvere debarred from the passeover: But leavened bread signified,* scelera, *vvickedneſſe;* Ergo, *vvicked men should by us be debarred from the Sacraments.* 1. *It is false that those that eat leavened bread vvere debarred from the passeover by Gods command: These tvvo differ much; he that eateth leavened bread shall be cut off, and he that eateth leaven shall be debarred from the feast of the passeover, even as these two; the childe that clattereth in time of Sermon, shall be whipt with rods, and the childe that clattereth in time of Sermon shall be excluded from hearing Sermon; When the Master forbiddeth to clatter in time of Sermon, under a punishment, he biddeth them not be absent from the Sermon: so when God forbiddeth to eat leaven, under a punishment, he forbiddeth not to exclude the man from the passeover, the Lord commandeth both to be done.* Pag. 241.

Ans. 1. This is *Erastus* his Argument, not the Argument of *Beza*, for eating of leaven signifieth a scandalous and openly wicked man; and if this be the Assumption, it is true, but the Syllogisme so formed, shall conclude against *Erastus*: 2. It is certain that God commandeth the Priests not to *violate his holy things*, *Ezech.* 22.26, *Hag.* 2.11.12. *Ezech.* 44.8,9,10,11. Else how failed they, in *keeping the charge of the Lord, in not differencing between the clean and the unclean?* Now to eat the passeover with leavened bread is an expresse violation of the holy things of God, *Exod.* 12. ver. 8. *You shall eat the flesh in that night, rost with fire and unleavened bread,* ver. 11. *And thus shall ye eat it*--- ver. 15. *Seven dayes shall ye eat unleavened bread, even the first day, ye shall put away leaven out of your houses*: 2. He that is unclean is forbidden to eat the passeover, *Lev.* 9.13. The clean only is to keep it: *And he that is clean, and not on a journey, and keepeth it not, that man shall bear his sin*; Ergo, the unclean are excepted; and he who is sanctified according to the

To eat the Passeover with unleavened bread a violation of that Sacrament.

purification of the sanctuary only by the Law, is to eat, 2 *Chro.* 30. 9. Therefore *Hezechiah* prayed that God *would pardon them that were not so cleansed, ver.* 18. To crave pardon presupposeth a sinne, *Num.* 9. 3, 4, 5, 6. But so it is, That he that eateth unleavened bread in any of these seven dayes, was *unclean*, and to be cut off for his uncleanness, and transgressed this Ceremoniall Law, *Exod.* 12. 8. 15. *Levit.* 9. 13. *Ergo*, he was not to be admitted *to the holy things of God*; except the Priests and those who had the charge of the Passeover, should know him to be purified, *Ezech.* 22. 26. *Hag.* 2. 11, 12. And we know it was the Priests part to pronounce any clean or unclean, & that the passeover was one of the chief of the holy things of God. 3. *Erastus* his conjecture, That he that did eat leavened bread, was not to absent himself from the Passeover; but to come *tali modo*, according to the Law: *As the childe that clattereth in time of Sermon, is not bidden be absent from the Sermon*, may prove as well that no unclean, no heathen, or uncircumcised, are forbidden to eat the Passeover; for no Law of God forbiddeth either to eat the Passeover, except this, that only the circumcised and the unclean were forbidden; when the Lord in his Law putteth an expresse and a differencing, or discriminative character on those that eat, to wit, that they be *circumcised and clean* who shall eat; *Ergo*, God, in that putteth an evident inhibition on those that are uncircumcised heathen and unclean, that they are not to eat, as when God Commandeth every Male to be circumcised; we infer then no Female were to be circumcised. And by this means the *uncircumcised Moabite*, the *Philistine*, were not by the *Priests* and *Porters* debarred out of the *Temple*, or from the *Passeover*, so they would be circumcised and turn *Jews*: *Even as the childe is not excluded by a command of the Master from hearing Sermon, only he is forbidden to clatter in time of Sermon:* But a Iew was both forbidden uncleanness Ceremoniall by an expresse Law, and by another Law he was forbidden to come to the Passeover; and a heathen, as heathen, was both forbidden to eat, and the Priests forbidden to admit him.

Erastus. *Though we should grant, That those that eat leaven were debarred from the Passeover; yet it shall not follow, that those that live wickedly, shall be debarred from the Lords Supper, for the Feast of unleavened bread, typified not the Supper of the Lord, but the whole time of our life: Otherwise, saith he, (in his Thesis) we may live*

wickedly

Wickedly all our dayes, except when we come to the holy Supper; as the Jews might eat unleavened bread at any time, except on those dayes when the Lord forbade them. Putting away of leaven.

Anſ. 1. We contend not, that debarring of men from any one Ordinance, was ſignified by *putting away of the Leaven*: But that by putting of leaven from their houſes and Table, was typified (as *Paul* here expoundeth it) the putting of a wicked perſon out the midſt of the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. compared with ver. 5, 6, 7. 13. If the Feaſt of unleavened bread, typified all our life, that we ſhould be holy; yet it had a ſpeciall relation to our Purification, when we did partake of the moſt holy Ordinances of God, ſuch as was the *Paſſeover* then, and to us the Lords Supper: Elſe, *Eraſtus* might ſay, God hath forbidden ſingle Chriſtians to live at all, except they lived holily, which is a vain conceit. It is not lawfull to *Eraſtus* to put ſignifications on types, at his will; and therefore that that Feaſt pointed out holineſſe all our life, is utterly denyed; for eating of leavened bread, except in theſe dayes forbidden, was not a ſin, nor any Ceremoniall type at all, no more then our common bread and wine are ſignes of Chriſts body and blood. 2. *Paul* compareth the Feaſt to the lump of the Viſible Church; ſo as the leaven was to be removed out of all houſes of *Iſrael*; becauſe it did Ceremonially infect, corrupt, and leaven them, and ſo was to be purged; ſo did the inceſtuous man, leaven the Viſible Church of *Corinth*, and was to be purged out: Nor do I contend, that the Lords Supper here is meant, though I know no ſolemn Spirituall Feaſt that the viſible Church now hath, but the Supper of the Lord: But rather I underſtand, Church-Communion in the dainties of the Goſpel, which are ſet forth to us under the ſimilitude of a Feaſt, *Matth.* 22. *Luke* 14. 16, 17, 18, *&c. Prov.* 9. 2, 3, 4, 5. *Cant.* 5. 1.

Eraſtus. *The leaven of the Paſſeover does not ſo ſignifie impurity of life, that Excommunication can be hence gathered: therefore the Apoſtle alludeth to that place, that or the like Way, as the Jews did Celebrate their Paſſeover Without leaven; ſo it becometh us to Celebrate our Paſſeover Without the leaven of malice and Wickedneſſe: Leaven ſimply, may either ſignifie good or evil, as* Matth. 13. *and* 16. *and* Potuit, *it might ſignifie our naturall corruption. For God not only forbiddeth to eat leaven, but to have it in the houſe; and leaven ſignifieth*

nifieth not Wickednesse so to be punished, as you say, even by death.

Ans. The *Leaven of the Passeover*, signified so impurity, as we are to put out the person that leaveneth the Church, out of the Church, as they were to put leaven out of the house; and not only simply, not to eat it; so are we not only, not to eat and drink with a scandalous man, but he is to be reputed no member of the Church, but a leavening and contagious man; and therefore *Paul* doth not here, as *Erastus* dreameth, show what way every one in his own personall practise and duty, as a single Christian is to do, that he may save his own soul; and therefore every one was to celebrate a Christian Passeover in his own soul, laying aside the leaven of malice: Though I grant, That *Paul*, *ver.* 8. doth infer and draw a conclusion of a personall purging out of the leaven of malice and hypocrisie out of every mans heart: But *Paul* doth expresly command the *Corinthians* as a convened Church, to put out from amongst them another man, for the saving of that other mans soul: And what they should do in a Church society toward the man, ποιησάντα τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, *Who hath done this*, to wit, down right they should Iudge him, *Cast him out, purge him out as a leavening peece.* And the world cannot give any other meaning of the words, then that, as the Iews were to put all leaven from amongst them, when they were to celebrate their Passeover: So the *Corinthians* were to exercise the like work, upon this incestuous man, and to put him out from amongst them, as one delivered to Satan, as a lump of sowre leaven; and we seek no more for Excommunication. 2. Leaven signifieth *Matth.* 13. good, the Kingdom of God is compared to leaven: But here it is corruption of contagious scandall in this incestuous man; and such leaven as *is to be cast out, and purged away.* Now, I hope, we must not purge out, and cast away the Kingdom of heaven: and *Matth.* 16. 6. The leaven of the corrupt and false Doctrine of Pharisees and Sadduces, that corrupteth the hearts of men, is meant, and of this leaven we are to beware: But why doth *Erastus* strive to bring the reader in a good opinion of leaven, which Paul would have us to detest? I know not a reason, but because the place is so evident for the casting out of an incestuous man from amongst the Corinthians, lest he should infect the flock, and that by the *Church convened together in the name and power of Christ, that his soul may be saved*; and this is the very excommunication

communication that we assert. 3. *This leaven*, (saith he) *may signifie naturall corruption.*: Now *Erastus* putteth us to (a *may* be,) but (a *may* be) will not do it: For the Text saith not, I hope, by *Erastus* his confession, that the poor man must be *delivered to Satan*, that is, miraculously killed, for naturall concupiscence. All the world thus are *delivered to Satan, as being heirs of wrath for sin Originall*, at least in demerit. 2. The man was not judged, *purged out*, and *cast out*, as leaven that sowred the Church, for naturall corruption. 3. Paul offendeth not with them, that they were puffed and mourned not for the mans Originall sin, but for his actuall wickednesse, because he had gone in to his fathers wife, an Abomination that the Gentiles are ashamed to name.

Erastus. *Then the man must be killed, as he that eat leavened bread was killed: and though the punishments of* Moses *Law as such, must not be brought in the Christian Church, yet if God subject men to the Magistrates Sword, men cannot free them from it, though there may be degrees of punishment.* Page 244.

Ans. We denyed that those that eat leavened bread with the Passeover were killed, but onely excommunicated and cut off from the congregation: God never subjected any to the sword, for that cause. 2. We deny that therefore by proportion the incestuous man should be killed; by what consequence will *Erastus* prove that those that gathered sticks on the Lords day, those that are stubborn to Father or Mother, those who commit fornication now in the Israel of God under the New Testament, must be stoned to death by the Magistrate, or miraculously killed by the Apostles? it must be by the same consequence, that *Erastus* reasoneth here. But did God kill immediatly any offenders at all for originall sin, some one more nor other? as *Erastus* dreameth this man was killed. 3. What warrant hath *Erastus* that the Devill killeth any one of the visible Church now under the New Testament, and any of the children of God, *whose spirit are saved in the day of the Lord? proferat tabulas. Erastus* saith it, neither Prophet nor Apostle in the Old or New Testament ever said it.

Erastus *said, an Anagogicall sense is not concludent.*

Ans. Where the Holy Ghost giveth the sense, it is false, saith *Beza*. 2. Why doth then *Erastus* conclude miraculous killing from the Types of the *Old Testament*?

Erastus.

Eraſtus. *Where I pray you doth* Paul *ſay that the puniſhment of eating leavened bread did typifie your Excommunication ?*

Anſ. The word Excommunication may be by the Church uſed as the Word, *Sacrament, Trinity.* But the thing is not ours, but an ordinance of Ieſus Chriſt. 2. *Paul* ſaith in this very place, as *Iſrael* were to put away leaven in their Paſſeover, ſo is the convened *Church of Corinth in the name and power of Chriſt to put out, judge and purge out a corrupting and leavening inceſtuous man,* and this is all we ſeeke for Excommunication.

Page 245. Eraſtus. *I never finde the name of the Paſſeover in the New Teſtament put for the Supper of the Lord.*

Anſ. We are not in ſuch need of that interpretation, as to put the name of the one for the other. But let *Eraſtus* ſhew where he readeth that the thing, to wit, that the one Sacrament ſucceeded to the other ; and *Beza* may thence inferre his point, if God would have no man to eat the Paſſeover with leavened bread, and if eating of leavened bread, and bread it ſelfe was to be put out of all the houſes of *Iſrael,* thereby ſignifying that inceſtuous and ſcandalous perſons are to be caſt out of the Church, and ſo from the Sacraments ; let *Eraſtus* ſee what *Beza* hath ſaid amiſſe here.

Eraſtus. *God would have the Ieᴡes to eate the Paſſeover ᴡithout leavened bread, that they might remember of their ᴡonderfull deliverance out of the hard bondage of Egypt, and of the deliverance of their firſt borne.*

De Preſbyt. page 92. *Anſ.* Reverend *Beza* ſaith theſe two were by-paſt benefits remembred in that Sacrament : But we have the Holy Ghoſt expounding that the putting away of leavened bread, did typifie the purging out of the inceſtuous men, and other ſcandalous perſons out of the Church, which is our point, otherwiſe let *Eraſtus* ſhew us what is meant by ὅλον τὸ φύραμα the whole Maſſe and lumpe, for it ſignifieth either one ſingle man; Or 2. The Maſſe and body of the viſible Church, of which the inceſtuous man was a Member ; or ſome third thing, which *Eraſtus* and his followers muſt teach us. Now the whole lumpe can neither ſignifie the inceſtuous man, nor any other ſingle member of the Church.

What is meant by the whole lumpe; and what by leaven.

Not the inceſtuous man, 1. He was not the whole lumpe in danger to be leavened, for he was the leven, then he was not the lump in danger to be leavened; for the one is the agent infecting, the other

the

the patient infected. The *whole lumpe* was the thing out of which the leaven was to be removed, the *terminus à quo*, the inceſtuous man was to be purged out, therefore the *leaven* cannot ſignifie wickedneſſe *in abſtracto*, as *Eraſtus* ſaith, but the wicked man *in concreto*; for the leaven muſt ſignifie that which is caſt out, ἐκ μέσου, *out of the midſt of them*, v. 2. Now this was not inceſt, but the man that had his fathers wife, and had done that deed. 2. Again, the leaven was the perſon to be delivered to Satan, that had a ſoul to *be ſaved in the day of the Lord Ieſus*. But wickedneſſe *in abſtracto* is *not delivered to Satan*, nor hath it a *Spirit to be ſaved in the day of the Lord*. 3. The leaven is ſuch a one as is to be judged, as is *Within the Church*, v. 12. and is *called a brother*, with whom we are *not to eat*, v. 11. now this cannot be ſaid of wickedneſſe in *abſtracto*. But neither can the *whole lumpe* be one ſingle man; 1. One ſingle man needed not the ſolemn conveening of the *Church in the Name and power of the Lord Jeſus*, for his perſonall purging, for his perſonall purging is not a *Church-act*, but an act of a mans daily converſation and Chriſtian walking. 2. The *purging out*, and the *caſting out is* ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν, v. 2 *out of the midſt of them*, then there was a ſociety to be purged; *Ergo*, not a ſingle man onely. Much more I ſaid before, which cannot but miſt *Eraſtus*, or any his followers, except they expound this *whole lump* to be the body of the viſible Church of *Corinth*. 2. So *Gal.* 5. 9. he addeth *v.* 10. *he that troubleth you*, (the lump in danger to be leavened,) *ſhall bear his judgement*, v. 12. *I would they were cut off that trouble you*. Then the whole *Churches of Galatia* were the troubled *lumpe*, & ſo it muſt be here, if this truth be ſo convincing out of the Text, let any *Eraſtian* extricate himſelf, if he can deny, but here is a Church-lump, a Church of Rulers συναχθέντων *gathered together in the Name and power of the Lord Ieſus*, that purgeth out of it ſelfe leaven, not wickedneſſe, *in abſtracto*, as I have demonſtrated, but a wicked man named a brother, leſt he leaven the whole Church, to the end his *Spirit may be ſaved*; Judge reader, if this be not name, nature and thing, of that which *Eraſtians* deny, to wit, of Excommunication. I humbly provoke them to make good ſenſe of the 1 *Cor.* 5. and ſhew me what is the wicked man. 2. The caſting out of the midſt of you. 3. The ſaving of his Spirit. 4. The convened together court, inſtructed with the Name, and authority,

and power of Chriſt, and if this be not a Church power, efficacious and authoritative, being ſteeled with the power of the Head of the Church. 5. What is the leaven? 6. What is the act of leavening? 7. What is the whole lumpe? 8. What is the purging out, putting out, and judging of the man? 3. We know *Eraſtus* denieth any Church Government at all, but ſome acts of punitive juſtice in the Magiſtrate. But the Churches praying, conſenting that a ſcandalous perſon ſhall be delivered to Satan, or ſome other waies puniſhed by the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, are acts of Church government, ſo proper to the Church, as the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate, cannot exerciſe ſuch Acts.

Hymeneus and Alexander not miraculouſly killed by Satan.

Eraſtus. *Paul delivered* Hymeneus *and* Alexander *the ſame way to Satan, by miraculous killing of him; and whereas it is ſaid, that they may learne not to blaſpheme: Judges ſpeake ſo when they kill Murtherers and Theeves, that he ſhall teach them to doe ſo no more by taking the head from them.*

Anſ. That word of a judge killing a man for Murther, *Sirra, Ile teach you other manners then to kill,* can no waies be aſcribed to *Paul*, who doth not ſcoffe ſo at taking away mens lives. *Paul* who wiſhed to be ſeparated from Chriſt, for the contumacious *Iewes*, and would not kill any by Satan, ſince his rod and power was *for edification*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. and that the *Spirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. he ſpeaketh more gravely and leſſe imperiouſly, and without boaſting and jeering in a matter of Salvation. 2. ἵνα παιδευθῶσι *that they may be inſtructed or diſciplined not to blaſpheme*; cannot be ſimply that they may blaſpheme no more, becauſe killed by the Devill. For 1. let *Eraſtus* in the Old or New Teſtament produce a parallel place for that Expoſition, where the word παιδευθῆναι to be inſtructed is aſcribed to the dead; but this is a common fault in all *Eraſtus* his expoſitions of Scripture, that they want all ground in Scripture, as let me put upon all the followers of *Eraſtus* to give a parallel to this Expoſition of *Mat.* 18. *Let him bee to thee*, that is, *to thee onely*, when Chriſt ſpeaketh of a generall Rule of all that ſcandalizeth. 2. *Let him be as a Heathen.* Give a place of Scripture for this. 1. *Let him be as ſuch Heathen onely as acknowledge* Ceſar, *and his Deputies for lawfull Iudges.* 2. A parallel for this we ſeek, *Let him be as a Heathen, that is, convene him before an heathen Iudge.*

Eraſtus his expoſitions all without ground of Scripture.

Iudge. 3. What Scripture expoundeth *delivering to Satan for edification, and not deſtruction*, 1 Cor. 5. to be a Magiſtraticall killing by the power of the Devill, that others may feare. 4. *Put out, purge out, judge thoſe only that are within, are expounded* by *Eraſtus*, pray for a miraculous deſtruction by the devill, as the lictor and hangman of the *Apoſtle*, that none may be killed miraculouſly for enormous ſcandals, no not ſuch as *Elimas the ſorcerer*, who was never within the *Church*; but thoſe that are within: And did the company of the Saints, pray with the Saints, that ſignes and wonders, and ſo miraculous killing might be wrought, not on any but on thoſe that are within the viſible Church, not on the enemies, and Iews haters of *Chriſt*, and without the Chriſtian *Churches*, when the Apoſtles miraculouſly eſcaped out of their priſons? *Act.* 4.29,30. *Act.* 5.19,20,21,22. *Act.* 12.7,8,9. *Act.* 16.25,26.27, 28? I might alledge many other ſuch like interpretations of *Eraſtus*. 5. παιδευειν in the New Teſtament, ſignifieth to inſtruct and chaſtiſe the living, never any ſuch thing is aſcribed to the dead. *Gal.* 5.22,30. *Tit.* 2.20. *Rev.* 3. 19. *Heb.* 12.10. *Luk.* 23.16,22. 2. *Cor*,6.9. *Act.*22.3. *Act.*7.22. as they that are taught to ſinne no more by being killed. 6. *Robert Stephan.* citeth in the margent, 1 *Cor.* 5.5. to expound it of excommunicating of *Hymeneus and Alexander*, ſo doth *Piſcator*, ſo *Calvin, Beza, Marlorat*, ſo *Vatablus* ſaith, *Quos ejeci ex eccleſia et cenſui magis dignos eſſe eccleſia Satane quam Chriſti, ſi non reſipiſcant.* 7. *Beza De* Presbyt.p.87. learnedly obſerveth that it is no Grammer; for if the effect of learning not to blaſpheme be ſuſpended upon the miraculous killing of *Alexander*, then he was firſt killed, & then learned not to blaſpheme. But ſo *Paul* could have ſaid he was killed, *ut non blaſphameret*, that he might not blaſpheme, not that he might learn not to blaſpheme.

CHAP. XII. Queſt. 8.

The eſchewing of company with the ſcandalous, vindicated from Eraſtus *his exceptions.*

BEſides other arguments from *Mat.* 18. and 1 *Cor.* 5. for excommunication, we argue thus: Thoſe upon whom the Church

is to put ſuch a publike note of ſhame or a σημεῖον, as they are to withdraw from their company, and not to eat and drink with them, thoſe are caſt out of the Church, and ſo cut off from the body of Chriſt, and excommunicated.

But the Church is to put ſuch a note of ſhame, as to withdraw from the company of, and not to eat with thoſe that are named brethren, and yet are *fornicators, covetous, idolators, extortioners, railers,* 1 Cor. 5.11. *and cauſe diviſions and offences contrary to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, Who ſerve not the Lord Jeſus, but their owne belly,* Rom.16.17,18. *Who walk diſorderly, are buſie-bodies, idle, and obey not the Doctrine of the Apoſtles.* 2 Theſ.3.11,12,13,14,15, *Ergo.*

The propoſition I prove, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. he ſaith, v. 9. *I wrote to you in an Epiſtle, not to keep company with fornicators,* the ſame word that in the abſtract is ſpoken of the inceſtuous man, v.1. by which it is clear *Paul* had forbidden any company with ſuch inceſtuous men. Now he had not forbidden them to keep company with dead men, if the man was to be miraculouſly killed, *Ergo,* it was his will before, that ſuch a one ſhould be judged, and put out, elſe he could not ſo ſharply rebuke them, for not caſting him out, and if now only he had firſt taught, and written to them to caſt him out: as if excommunication had been in this ſame very Chapter inſtituted by *Paul,* and v. 11. Νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα *now I have written unto you, not to keep company with one named a brother, who is a fornicator*; this muſt be in the ſame Chapter, for νυνὶ δὲ *now I have written,* muſt be in relation to this v. 9. *I wrote unto you in a Epiſtle* before: now if here at this preſent he wrote to them, not to keep company with him, it muſt be when he commandeth to caſt him out v.13. and to judge him v. 12. ſo that not to keep company with ſuch fornicators, muſt neceſſarily preſuppoſe a caſting out, and that the fornicator, with whom we are not to keep company in a familiar manner, is a man caſt out of the Church, and ſo excommunicated. 2. *Paul* would never forbid brotherly familiarity with any remaining a brother, a member of the Church, and of a body with us in viſible profeſſion of the truth, as partakers of one body and blood of Chriſt, as all the members of the Church eating at one Lords table are, 1. *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. 3. The Apoſtle ſaith ſuch a fornicator is but ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος named a brother, and ſo in the eſteem of the Church no brother, and ſo not of the viſible body of Chriſt. 4. *Paul*

bringeth

bringeth in this as a reason why they should cast out the incestuous man, v. 9. *did not* (saith he) *I write to you before, and do I not now write,* v. 11. *even now that you are not to keep intimate familiarity with such titular brethren, who are brethren in name only? Therefore put out from amongst you this man,* v. 13. the Apostles argument to infer they ought to judge, and put such a man out of the Church; because they are not to eat with him, were of no weight, if this eschewing of familiarity with one who is a brother only in name, did not infer the Churches casting of him out.

Erastus, *it is false that* Paul *forbiddeth to eat with him who is cast out, for he forbiddeth not eating with a dead man.* L. 3. c 8. p. 247. 248

Ans. This is to beg the question, *Erastus* should teach us how *Pauls* argument cohereth; for the text saith, he must be cast out; why? you must not eat with him; then he supposeth he must be a living man, for *Paul* needed not fear they would eat with dead men, nor can this be *Pauls* consequence; *you are not to eat with the incestuous,* Ergo, *he must be delivered to Sathan, that he may be miraculously killed*; for that is a false consequence, for then all covetous persons, all drunkards, all idolators, all extortioners, should have been killed by *Paul*, because with none of these we are to eat.

Erastus, *It is false that* Paul *forbiddeth us to eat meat with such; Yea in no place he forbiddeth to eat with heathen, but elsewhere granteth it to be lawfull, and in this Chapter he permitteth private commerce with them.* Pag 248.

Ans. 1. Let the reader judge whether *Erastus* refuteth *Paul*, or *Beza*, *Paul* forbiddeth to eat with a brother; that is a fornicator: *Erastus* saith, he forbiddeth no such thing. 2. Though I think Christians may eat with heathens, 1. *Cor.* 10. 27. and that *Paul* did eat with heathen; yet it is no argument to say, it is therefore lawfull to eat with one cast out of the Church, because we may eat with heathens to gain them, and we are not bidden abstain from heathens company, that they may be ashamed of their religion, (though Christians are to use no heathens with intimate familiarity as we do our brethren in Christ;) But we are to eschew intire fellowship with a scandalous and cast out brother, to gain him, *that he may be ashamed,* 2 Thes. 3. 14. and in this a scandalous brother is in worse case then a heathen: But in other respects he is in better condition, as being under the medicine of the Church.

How eschewing intimate fellowship with a scandalous brother, is a Church-censure.

3. Though

3. Though we may have commerce, and buy and ſell with heathens, and neglect no duties of humanity to them, as to receive them into our houſe, and to be hoſpitall to them, *Heb.* 13.2. *Iob* 31.32. Yet this will conclude intire fellowſhip with neither heathen, or ſcandalous brethren; Yea, we are not to receive a falſe teacher into our houſe, 2. *Ioh.* ver. 10. Yet are we not forbidden to neglect duties of common humanity to falſe Teachers, though we be forbidden intireneſſe of Brotherly fellowſhip with them.

Eraſtus. *There is not the ſame reaſon of holy things, and of private civill things; for this, not eating, belongeth to private converſing with men, not to publike Communion with them in the holy things of God: One ſaith, It is in our liberty, Whether we converſe familiarly with wicked men, or not, But it is not in our power, Whether we come to the Lords Supper, or not; And* Paul *will not have us to deny any thing that belongeth to Salvation; and therefore he ſaith,* 2 Theſſ. 3. *Admoniſh him as a Brother; and none, I hope, can deny, but the Sacraments are helps of godlineſſe and Salvation.*

Anſ. 1. It is true, that avoiding of the company of ſcandalous Brethren, hath in it ſomething civill; but it is a cenſure-ſpirituall, and a Church-cenſure, two wayes: 1. *Objectively*, in its tendency, *Reſpectu termini ad quem.* 2. *Effectively*, in its riſe and cauſe, *Reſpectu termini à quo*, it is a ſpirituall cenſure *Objectively*, becauſe it tendeth to make the party aſhamed, that he may repent, and become a Brother with whom we are to converſe; and therefore is deſtinated for no civill uſe, but for the good of his ſoul, that is a member of a Church, that he may return to what he was. 2. This cenſure, though one private Brother may exerciſe it upon another, yea, a woman on a man, who yet hath no Authority over the man, is notwithſtanding in its riſe and efficient cauſe, a Church-cenſure. 1. If Chriſt will not have one Brother to condemne another, while firſt he rebuke him; and if he be not convinced, while he do the ſame before two or three witneſſes; and if he yet be not gained, one private Brother may not after conviction, before two or three witneſſes repute him *as a Heathen*, or complain of him before an Heathen Iudge, as *Eraſtus* ſaith; How ſhall we imagine any one ſingle Brother may withdraw Brotherly fellowſhip from another Brother, by his own private Authority, while he firſt be ſentenced before the Church? And the Church ſhall convince him to *walk*

diſ-

disorderly, to *cause divisions and offences, to be a Fornicator, a Covetous person*, and so to be unworthy of the intire Brotherly fellowship of another? For if this order were not in the Church, every Brother might take up a prejudice at his Brother, and so break all bands of Religious Communion, and Brotherly fellowship, and dissolve and make ruptures in the Churches: Now certain it is, These Texts, *Rom.* 16. 17, 18. 2 *Thes.* 3. 11, 12, *&c*, in the letter, intimate no such order as is *Matth.* 18. But it is presupposed, as clear by other Scriptures, we are not to withdraw from an offending Brother, but after such an order: Now the places in the letter, except we expound them by other Scriptures, do not bear that we are to rebuke our Brother, before we withdraw from him, contrary to *Levit.* 19. 17. 2. If I am to withdraw from a Brother, all Brotherly fellowship by these places; then I am to esteem him as a Heather, and as a Brother in name, not in reality, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. Whereas once I esteemed him a Brother, and did keep Brotherly fellowship with him; now this is materially Excommunication: I do no more in this kinde to one who is formally Excommunicated; yea, I am not so strange to a Heathen; *Ergo*, This I must have done upon some foregoing sentence of the Church, otherwise, I might un-Church and un-Brother the man whom the Church neither hath, nor can, un-Church and un-Brother. 3. Eschewing of Brotherly fellowship to any, is an act of Government distinct from the Preaching of the Word, tending to make a Brother that walketh disorderly ashamed, that he may repent, and of a Brother in name only, may become a Brother in reallity, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. But this act of Government belongeth not to the Christian Magistrate; for every Brother (saith *Erastus*) may exercise it toward his Brother; *Ergo*, here is Church-Government that the Magistrate hath no hand in, contrary to the way of *Erastus*, and not in the hands of Pastors, for it is distinct from Preaching; nor is it in a Colledge of Pastors, Doctors, and Elders, for *Erastus* denyeth any such Colledge; *Ergo*, here every one must govern another, the man the woman, and the woman the man; the son the father, if he walk unorderly, and the Father the Son; this can be nothing, but the greatest Confusion on Earth. 4. To put any to shame, especially publikely, by way of punishment for publike sins, must come from some Iudges, or others armed with

with Authority, *Judg.* 18. 7. 1 *Cor.* 4. 14. 1 *Cor.* 6. 5. 1 *Cor.* 25. 34. Then the *Apostles* sense cannot be, that every one hath power of himselfe without the Church, or any authority therefrom to put his brother to shame; for when a brother is not to eat with a scandalous brother, he must be convinced by the Church to be scandalous, and so cast out, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11, 12, 13. as we have proved before, and every man here should be his owne judge, and party in his owne cause, except he put his brother to some shame by an higher authority then his owne. The word σημειῶσθε, is to put a publike note or σημεῖον upon the offender. So *Stephanus.* So *Piscator, Nota ignominiosâ excommunicationis. Pomponius lætus de Magistr.* Rom. c. 21. *Censores quinto quoq; anno creari solebant, hic prorsus cives sic notabantur, ut qui Senator esset ejiceretur Senatu, qui eques Romanus equum publicum perderet,* &c. *Mathæus Harnisch & Geo. Gabellus,* who adde to *Zanchius* his Commentary in 2 *Thes.* say, *Est notâ quâdam insignire, et in aliquem animadvertere; ut censores apud Romanos notare aliquem solebant,* they expound it the publike note of Excommunication. *Beza* saith it is not σημάνειν to signifie and declare, but σημειῶσθε *notate, & veluti inustâ notâ compungite.* So *Calvin, Marlorat.*

And I wonder that *Erastus* can say with any, that *it is in our power to converse, or not to converse with wicked men*; are we not discharged by Gods Spirit to converse with them? As we are commanded to eat and drinke at the Lords Table, and is it in our power morally to obey, or disobey any Commandement of God? Except *Erastus* will say with Papists, that God doth here give counsels, not commands, *Rom.* 16. 17. 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. 1 *Cor.* 5. 9, 11.

And whereas *Erastus* saith, *Paul* will have us 2 *Thes.* 3. 15. to admonish this man as a brother; *Ergo,* In holy things, and in the *Sacraments,* that are helpes of piety and Salvation, we are not to cast him off: It is true, the cast out man is not to be reputed *as an enemy, but a brother.* Yet a sicke and diseased brother, under the roughest Medicine of the Church, to wit, the rod of Excommunication, *that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.* But withdrawing of brotherly fellowship, is not a meere civill unbrothering of him, for if the brotherly fellowship of Christians must be spirituall, religious, and for the edifying of one anothers soules, for exhorting *one another,* to prevent hardning of heart,

for

for provoking one another to love, and to good works, to teach one another, to comfort and support one another, as we are expresly commanded by the Holy Ghost, *Heb.* 3. 13. *Heb.* 10. 24. *Col.* 3. 16. 1 *Thess.* 5. 11, 14. *Mal.* 3. 16. *Jer.* 50. 5. *Zach.* 8. 22. *Psal.* 42. 4. I wonder where *Erastus* learned this Divinity, to say, the denying of this edifying Communion to a scandalous brother, while he be ashamed and repent, *Is to deny nothing that belongeth to his salvation:* Admonition is but one of twenty comfortable acts of Communion, which we deny not to him, least the man should despaire, and we should cast off all care, hope, or intention to save his soul, whereas the genuine and intrinsecall intention of avoiding him, and casting him out of the Church, is, *that he may be saved:* Lastly, we deny not admonition, and preaching of the word to the man, thus cast out, because they be *converting Ordinances*, simply necessary to work the mans humiliation and repentance; but the Lords Supper is a *confirming Ordinance*, and denied to the excommunicated while he is in that condition upon that very reason, that it is denied to *Pagans and Heathens*; and though it be an help of piety, it is no help either to a *Pagan*, or an excommunicate man, but damnation: *But it may be, the excommunicate man hath faith.* I answer, To us in the Court of the Church, in which the Seals are dispensed, he hath no more then a *Heathen* hath; and therefore, *in confirming Ordinances*, he is looked on by the Church as an *Heathen*; and if the reason of *Erastus* be good, *The Church is to deny no helps of godlinesse and salvation to him, though we deny private food to his body, because the Sacraments are necessary helps.* Then 1. I much doubt, if the Church be to *deny the necessary helps of godlinesse and salvation* to a *Pagan* living amongst us; *Ergo*, shall we not deny the Sacraments to a Pagan? 2. We are not to avoid his company, and deny the edifying acts of Communion, which I named before, for these are necessary helps of salvation. 3. It is not the mans sin by this reason, *That he eateth and drinketh unworthily*; for if it be not the Churches sin to give him the seals, because *the Seals are adminiclees and helps of piety, and saving of the soul*; by the same reason, it is not the mans sin to receive the Lords Supper, for it must be equally an help of godlinesse and salvation to the Communicant receiving, as to the Church giving: Now *Paul* saith, 1 *Cor.* 11. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh to him-*

Sacraments though helps of piety, yet not to be given to all.

Erastus p. 248. *Ceterum sacramenta esse adminicula pietatis & salutis, nullus negat, proinde non sunt haec, negganda petentibus, &c.*

himſelf judgement. So *Eraſtus* teacheth us, that it may be a ſin to Swine publikely known to be ſuch, to receive pearles, when it is no ſin, but the Churches duty to give theſe pearls to ſuch known Swine, which is moſt abſurd and impious.

Pag. 249. Eraſtus. *I ſaid before, that God doth not exclude ſinners from the Sacraments, but gather them in to them; that they may be more and more invited to repentance, and more eaſily raiſed up again; for Sacraments, and ſo many Ceremonies alſo, were for this end ordained, that they might draw men to the love and care of true piety and holyneſſe,* as *Moſes* ſaith, *Deut.* 14.

Anſ. *Eraſtus* acknowledgeth this to be no new Argument; therefore we may paſſe it, it is the chief pillar of his opinion: But I put it in forme thus, to *Eraſtus.*

Thoſe whom God inviteth to repentance, thoſe he will not exclude from the Sacraments: But now under the Goſpel, he inviteth all, even many Pagans and Heathen to repentance, 1 *Tim.* 2.4. *God will have all,* even Heathen Magiſtrates, *to be ſaved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth,* ſo *Act.* 17.30. *God now commandeth all men, every where, even the Idolators, and blinde Philoſophers at Athens, who erected an Altar to the unknown God, ver.* 23. and who jeered at the Doctrine of the Reſurrection, *ver.* 32. even thoſe God inviteth *to repentance*; *Ergo,* God excludeth not Pagans from the Sacraments; but the concluſion is abſurd and blaſphemous; therefore ſo muſt one of the premiſes be, but the Aſſumption is Scripture; *Ergo,* The Major Propoſition of *Eraſtus* muſt be blaſphemous. God inviteth ſcorners to repentance, and rebukes are means of repentance; *Ergo,* we may rebuke ſcorners; Gods ſpirit ſaith, *Rebuke not a ſcorner,* Prov. 9.7,8. His Propoſition then muſt be, *Thoſe whom God inviteth to repentance, thoſe God excludeth not from any mean of piety and ſanctity:* It is moſt falſe, God inviteth Dogs and Swine to repentance, and commandeth them to be holy, and the pearls of the Goſpel are means of repentance, and holineſſe: Muſt we therefore, *Caſt pearls to dogs and ſwine?* The contrary our Saviour injoyneth, *Matth.* 7.6. 2. *Moſes, Deut.* 14.1. forbiddeth diverſe Ceremonies and Sacraments of the Heathen by this Argument: *Ye are the children of the Lord your God*; and he ſaith expreſly, that the *ſtranger may eat ſome unclean thing*, but the Lord ſaith to them, *You ſhall not do ſo, for thou art an holy people to*

the

the Lord thy God: Whence it is evident *Moſes* ſaith poynt blank contrary to *Eraſtus*; for *Moſes* ſaith, that Ceremonies and Sacraments are for this end, to draw only the holy and ſanctified people of God, to a further love and ſtudy of true piety and ſanctity; was not the eating of the Paſſeover a mean of Repentance, as well as the eating of the Lords Supper? no queſtion, but God invited the uncircumciſed to repentance, but forbiddeth them to eat the Paſſeover.

Beza ſaid, *Sinners vvere indeed called to the ſacrifices, but ſuch as profeſſed repentance.*

Eraſtus ſaith, *Then vve agree, for vve diſpute only of thoſe vvho acknovvledgeth their ſins, and promiſe amendment.*

Eraſtus his contradiction, in excluding both ſome and none at all from the Sacraments.

Anſ. We are not willing to hold up a needleſſe controverſie with *Eraſtus*; but *Eraſtus* ſaith, and his Arguments conclude in the Old Teſtament, *None for Morall uncleanneſſe, and impenitency vvere debarred from the holy things of God*; Ergo, *We are to debarre none in the Nevv Teſtament*; yea, *2. Paul* did never command to debar any, nor did Chriſt debar *Judas*, nor the *Phariſees* debar the lewdeſt Publicans, nor the Apoſtles *Simon Magus* from the Sacraments; *Ergo*, ſaith he, we are to debar none at all: now here *Eraſtus* clearly contradicteth himſelf, and ſaith, *We diſpute only of ſuch as acknowledge their ſins and promiſe amendment*: But let *Eraſtus* ſay, *Did* Iudas *acknowledge his ſin and promiſe amendment*: Did all the morally unclean in *Corinth*, ſuch as repented not of their uncleanneſſe, and fornication, and laſciviouſneſſe which they committed, 2 *Cor.* 12. 21. acknowledge their ſin, and promiſe amendment? and did thoſe that were partakers of the Table of Devils acknowledge their ſin and promiſe amendment? And yet I brought the very words of *Eraſtus*, in which he ſaith right down in a Catholick aſſertion, without exception, not any of thoſe are to be debarred from the Sacraments: Why? *The Sacraments* (ſaith he) are *Adminicula pietatis, et reſipiſcentiæ, are helps to godlineſſe and repentance*: And I aske of *Eraſtus*, doth the Lord invite none to repentance, but thoſe that do *acknowledge their ſin and promiſe amendment*? And will *Eraſtus* have helps of repentance denied to all thoſe who acknowledge not their ſins? then let him give us Arguments in the Old or New Teſtament, by which he can demonſtrate, that thoſe who acknowledge not their ſins, and promiſe

Pag. 249. *Nam de illis ſolis (an arcendi ſint a Sacramentis) diſputamus qui peccatum ſuum agnoſcunt, & meliora promittunt.*

not amendment, are debarred in the Old Teſtament, from all the holy things of God, and in the New, from the Sacraments: Let *Eraſtus* extricate himſelf if he can.

It is worthy conſideration, whether *Eraſtus* will have all thoſe only that acknowledged their ſins and repent, admitted to the *holy things of God in the Old Teſtament*; if not, he muſt ſhew a difference, why pearls might be caſt to Swine, and ſcorners rebuked, and holy things prophaned by the uncircumciſed & prophane in the old Teſtament, not in the New: this he ſhall not ſhew, if they were debarred who repented not, how ſaith he in all his book, that none were debarred from the holy things of God in the Old Teſtament for Morall uncleanneſſe?

Pag. 249. Eraſtus. *But we impugne this which you ſay, that God hath ordained Presbyters or Elders to be judges and examinators of that buſineſſe: But we ſay, that God neither commanded in the Old, or New Teſtament, that Prieſts or any other, ſhould examine thoſe who brought oblations for ſin, whether they did truly repent, or diſſemble only; and ye ſay there be choſen Elders who ſhould try this in the New Teſtament.*

Anſ. 1. Elſewhere I have proved from Scripture, that the *Prieſts* did try judicially, thoſe for whom they offered Sacrifice: If the Leaper had not bidden ſo many dayes as the Law required, if the Prieſts ſhould offer for him, he ſhould be partiall in the Law, and if the diſeaſe be not removed, he cannot offer for him, *Matth.* 8.4. *Lev.* 14.3,4 9,10,11,12.

2. Obſerve good Reader, How craftily *Eraſtus* paſſeth from one queſtion to another: All his Arguments hitherto, both in his *Theſis* and in his Book, conclude that no man, in either Old, or New Teſtament, ever was, or ought to be debarred from *the holy things of God:* Becauſe there is neither precept, nor promiſe, nor practiſe in *Moſes,* in the *Prophets,* or *Apoſtles* for it: 2. Becauſe, *The Sacraments are helps of repentance. 3. Becauſe all are invited and commanded to come.* Now here *Eraſtus* flyeth to another Queſtion: Whether the unworthy *ſhould be debarred by Prieſts in the Old, and by certain ſelect and choſen Elders in the New Teſtament?* This is a far other Queſtion: for let him anſwer our Arguments, by which we prove that pearls and the *holy things of God,* ought to be denied to all *Dogs, Swine,* and prophane men, whereas *Eraſtus* ſaith, all

thoſe

thoſe are invited to come; and then we ſhall yoak with *Eraſtus*, or any other, by whom, or by whoſe authority theſe pearls ought to be denied: whether by the Church, that is, by the Elders of the Church, and people conſenting, or by the civill Magiſtrate. Now this latter queſtion to *Eraſtus*, is no queſtion at all: for if none ought to be debarred from the Sacraments at all; but all muſt come promiſcuouſly, as their owne good or evill ſpirit inclineth them, it is a vaine thing for *Eraſtus* to make any queſtion at all, by whom they ought to be debarred; for it is all one, as to aske the queſtion, by whom ſhould thoſe who are to be gradued Doctors of Phyſick, be tryed and examined, whether by the faculty, and Colledge of of Phyſitians of the place, or by none at all: If you lay downe this ground, that there neither is, nor ought to be any graduated Doctors at all in the world, the other of thoſe, who are to try thoſe who are graduated is vaine, if all be invited to a free banquet, poor, and rich, leaper, and clean: it is a vain queſtion, whether be there ſome Maſters of the houſe who ſhould try who are worthy, and to be admitted to the feaſt, and who unworthy, and to be debarred.

Eraſtus, *It is madneſſe to ſay, that* Paul *by forbidding private eating, doth underſtand nothing but a debarring from the Sacraments, for* 1. Cor. 11. *he debarreth none from the Sacrament.* Pag. 249. 250.

Anſ. Neither *Beza*, nor any of ours ſay, that they are both one puniſhment; but that where we are forbidden to eat with a ſcandalous brother, it is preſumed the Church doth caſt him out of her ſociety: nor doth *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 11. invite all to come to the ſupper. How withdrawing from ſcandalous brethren, may inferre excommunication.

Beza *ſaid, he to whom leſſe is denied, as that we eat not with him, in our private houſes, to him more is denied, to wit, that he ſhould not be admitted to the Lords ſupper.*

Eraſtus *ſaith, that to whom leſſe is denied, to him more is denied, is true in gifts, but not in puniſhments, and in things of the ſame kind, but not in things divers, and in things free, not in things of which one is commanded by God, and another thing not commanded; it holdeth not in puniſhments, he to whom the city is denied, and who is baniſhed, his life is not denied to him, he who is puniſhed in his purſe, is not killed; for that a father denieth to his ſon an unworthy thing, yet he denieth not mayment to him.* Pag. 250. 251.

Anſ. Eraſtus in this granteth he wrongeth *Beza*, as if he had ſaid

said, to deny a private table, and the Lords table, were one and the same punishment. *Beza* saith, the one is a lesse, the other a greater punishment. 2. *If it be true in gifts, that he to whom lesse is given, more is given, then it holdeth here in our case*; because private fellowship with the Saints is a gift of God, and if the Lords body given for us, and to us in the Lords supper, be not a greater gift, it is nothing: so then if a lesse gift be denied, the Lords supper a greater gift is denied. 2. It must hold in the private punishments, inflicted for an higher punishments cause, private communion with the Saints is denied, because the man is cast out of the Church; *Ergo*, farre more are the highest priviledges of the Church denied: as liberty is denied to a man, because he is condemned to dye; *Ergo*, farre more is life denied to him; a mans house is denied to him, because he is banished; *Ergo*, farre more is his city and countrey denied to him: But a man is not punished in his purse, because he is condemned to dye, it followeth not; *Ergo*, he should rather dye, because the one punishment is not relative to the other. 3 Because not eating with a scandalous man is a spirituall punishment, as I have proved: therefore it is of that same kind with excommunication, and therefore it holdeth here. 4. Abstinence from the private fellowship of a scandalous brother is not free, but commanded of God, and so is debarring from the Lords supper, not free, but commanded.

Page 252. Erastus, *When he forbiddeth such, no not to eat, he forbiddeth,* 1. *Neer communion of familiarity.* 2. *Not to eat with them, which is to forbid all signes of neer communion.*

Ans. It is clear he proveth they should cast him out, because *I wrote to you that you should not keep company with such,* v. 9. no more to eat with such; *Ergo*, farre lesse (would he say) should he be a leavening member in the lumpe and masse of Christs body.

Erastus, *I wrote unto you, that ye should not keep company with such; then* Paul *speaketh here of a thing, concerning which he had spoken before, though they understood him not: it is like they sought* Pauls *judgement of their conversing with men: But of delivering the man to Satan, he had not spoken before, as is clear in the Text.*

Ans. This is a strong argument for us, if *Paul* had never spoken, nor written to them of the delivering of the man to Satan, that is, of the miraculous killing of him, how could he in reason and conscience

conscience chide them, because they prayed not that he might be miraculously killed? ἵνα ἐξαρθῇ? it is not possible they could mourn for not joyning in a businesse, that *Paul* had never revealed to them to be Gods will. Yea it is a strong argument to me, that delivering to Satan was excommunication, of which he had taught them before, (else their mourning had been unreasonble) and which he pointed at to them as a limbe of excommunication, to wit, their not familier conversing with the scandalous.

Erastus. *And when he has shown how they ought to flee the company of the scandalous, he returneth to his former purpose, commanding the wicked man to be killed: This then he saith, I commanded you to eschew the company of wicked brethren, not of the heathen, whom the Lord shall judge.* Pag. 252.

Ans. 1. The Text can bear no such exposition, for the reasons I have given before. 2. The coherence is clear; *I wrote before that you should not keep company with wicked brethren: therefore put out that wicked man from amongst you.* But by *Erastus* his glosse, there is neither sense, nor coherence in the words.

Erastus. *The end of refusing familiar conversing with the scandalous, is, that he may be ashamed; and you say, that same is the end of debarring from the supper; then it must follow, as private conversing can do the contrary, to wit, it can foment and nourish sinnes, both in the brother we converse with, and in us, so the frequent use of the Lords supper should nourish vices in us, which were wickedness to think.* Pag. 252, 253.

Ans. This presumeth, that to avoyd a scandalous brother, and to debarre him from the Sacraments, must be formally one, which we teach not. 2. Hence it followeth, since they be divers formally, they cannot have the same formall and intrinsecall ends. 3. The frequent eating at the Lords table, in a scandalous man, doth dispose him more and more to sinne, as frequently sinning inclineth more to sinne; but this is by the frequent abusing of Gods ordinance, and not from the nature of the Sacrament.

Erastus. *Paul forbiddeth not ill men of the company of good men, but he admonisheth good men, to flee ill men, that they may be ashamed. But when you deny the Sacraments to any, you command not the Godly not to come to the supper with the wicked, but you forbid the scandalous to come to the supper.* Pag. 253.

Ans. There is no solidity in this conjecture, it leaneth upon the perpetuall

perpetuall mistake of *Erastus* in all this dispute, as if we held, That *to be debarred from familiar fellowship with the Saints,* and *from the Sacrament, were one and the same thing:* Else, I see no conclusion that *Erastus* doth, or can infer against us. 2. It is false, that wicked men are not discharged the company of Saints; for in so far as fellowship with the Saints, is a spirituall mean of the gaining of their souls by Teaching, Exhorting, Edifying, Comforting the wicked and scandalous, being Dogs and Swine are forbidden to touch such a Pearl; Yea, God layeth a charge on wicked men, while they remain in that case, not to meddle with *Confirming Ordinances* (with *some Converting Ordinances* they may,) as *Psal.* 50. 16. *But to the wicked God said, What hast thou to do to declare my Statutes: or that thou takest my Covenant in thy mouth?* 17. *Seeing thou hatest Instruction, and castest my Word behinde thee.* Here the wicked are forbidden to Teach or speak, to the instructing of others, which is a speciall act of Christian fellowship between Brother and Brother, *Col.* 3. 16. *Heb.* 3. 13. *Heb.* 10. 24. 1 *Thes.* 5. 11. 14. *Because they hate to be Instructed of others:* And you know how Christ speaketh to the unworthy intruder of himself on the secrets and spirituall marrow and comforts of the Gospel, *Matth.* 22. *ver,* 12. *Friend, How camest thou here, not having thy Wedding garment?* Ezra 4. 3. *But* Zerubbabel *and* Joshua, *and the rest of the chief of the Fathers came and said unto the Adversaries of* Iudah *and* Benjamin, *You have nothing to do with us, to build an house unto our God; But we our selves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel:* Doth not God expressly forbid *David to build an house to his name?* 1 Chron. 22. 8. 2 Chron. 6. 9. And we know it is a typicall discharge layed upon men of blood, not to touch the holiest things of God; but that men of Peace must meddle with them, *Isa.* 1. 13. *Bring no more vain Oblations, &c.* All which holdeth forth, that not only those who have the charge of the *house of the Lord,* to see that no Swine and Dogs prophane the holy things of God; but they are forbidden all private Ordinances and publike, in so far as they can make no other use of them, but to defile them.

The scandalous are forbidden to come to the Sacraments.

Erastus saith, *They be wickedly forbidden to come to the Lords Supper, who desire to Celebrate the memoriall of his death.*

Beza *Replieth Well,* 1. *What if he know not what he desireth who cometh?* 2. *What if there be just suspition or clear evidence that he*

playeth

playeth the Hypocrite? 3. *What if it concern the whole Church that his desire be suspended?*

Erastus. *The first cause is not to purpose, because we speak of those that are well instructed.* 2. *The second is bred in the brain of* Beza; *I am compelled to think, that he that publikely professeth he is grieved for his sins, and that he purposeth to live a holy life in time to come, that he thinketh as he speaketh, if he remain not in that purpose: I also remain not alwayes in my good purpose; his desire is an Argument of Piety, which should not be smothered and oppressed, but excited and nourished: And this opinion of* Beza *dependeth on the Judgement of men; neither hath the Lord committed the Examination of some to Elders: And it is folly to say, It concerns the Church to delay, to do that which the Lord hath Commanded me to do.*

De recte institutis ego me semper disputare protestatus fui.

Ans. 1. *Erastus* professeth he standeth for their admission to the Lords Supper, who are *Recte instituti, & profitentur dolere se propter peccata sua, who are instructed in the grounds of Christian Religion, and repenteth of their sins, or professeth it*: And he said before, as I observed it, *If any shall be found who shall trample on the Sacraments,* Ego hunc minime admittendum censeo: I *judge such a man should not be admitted to the Sacraments*: Whence it is clear, That *Erastus* professeth that the ignorant and the scandalous should be debarred from the Lords Supper: But, good Reader, Observe that *Erastus* contradicteth himself in all his Arguments; for he proveth, that not any one Christian in the Visible Church, ignorant, or not ignorant; who professe their Repentance, or not professe it, can be excluded from the Sacraments; but that all are commanded by Christ to come. But *Erastus* saith, *Scriptura illos, de quibus nos loquimur, nec à sacrificiis arcet, nec à sacramentis aliis ullis*: *Imò sub penâ capitis mandat, ut universi mares,* &c. *The Scripture excludeth none from Sacrifices, or any other Sacraments: But commandeth that all the Male Children, Jews and strangers, who are not legally unclean, and from home, should compear at* Jerusalem *thrice a year before the Lord*: And pag. 104. *In sacris literis non tantum non inveniri aliquos à sacramentis propter solam vitæ turpitudinem, ab actos esse, sed contrarium potius probari*: And *John Baptist* (saith he) *Baptized all that came to him, Pharisees and Sadducees, whom he affirmeth to be a Generation of Vipers,* Ex quo intelligimus: *Whence we understand, that Ministers are not to deny the Sacraments to those who seek them,*

An evident contradiction in Erastus through his whole book. Lib. 3. c. 3. p. 206, 207

Lib. 1. c. 4. pag. 112.

and the Iudgement is to be left to God, Whether he who profeſſeth Repentance, diſſemble, or deal truly and ſincerely: Yea, when *Eraſtus* ſaith, *That it is not in all the Scripture to be found,* Aliquos a Sacramentis propter ſolam vitæ turpitudinem abactos eſſe: *That any were debarred from the Sacraments for only Wickedneſſe of life; but rather the contrary may be proved*, either *ignorance of God,* oppoſed to *due inſtruction, and profeſſed impenitency*, is no wickedneſſe of life, which is moſt abſurd; or then in Scripture, ſome muſt be debarred from the Sacraments for wickedneſſe of life only: But *Eraſtus* ſaith plainly, *None in Scripture are debarred from the Sacraments, for only Wickedneſſe of life*: And ſo they are not debarred, becauſe they profeſſe not Repentance. And *Eraſtus* ſaith, *Chriſt ſaid, Drink ye all of this, and* Iudas *was not excepted: Chriſt went into the Temple with moſt Wicked men: the Phariſees and Sadduces were Baptized with the ſame Baptiſme of* Iohn *vvith them*: Then *Eraſtus* will exclude none at all, no not thoſe whom Chriſt pronounced to ſin againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, and the convincing light of their own minde, *Matth.* 12. 31, 32. *Ioh.* 9. 39, 40, 41. and 15. 24. and 7. 28. Yea, pag. 117. He will have none excluded in *Corinth, not thoſe that are impenitent, and thoſe that vvere partakers of the Table of Devils.* Pag. 116. *When Chriſt commandeth all to eat and all to drink, he excludeth none that profeſſeth themſelves to be Diſciples*: But many profeſſe no Repentance, *Who profeſſe themſelves Diſciples*: See pag. 117, 118. and the following pages. 2. *Eraſtus* ſaith, *He is compelled to think, That he that publikely profeſſeth ſorrovv for ſin, doth think as he ſpeaketh*: But to whom ſhall he profeſſe it? To the Church? Then hath the Church power to accept the confeſſion of ſcandalous men, ere they be admitted to the Lords Supper: *Eraſtus* will ſtand at this, for it is Government in the hands of the Church; if he muſt confeſſe to the Civill Magiſtrate, who made him a Steward of the Seals, and Myſteries of the Goſpel? Nor is the Church to think, as *Eraſtus* is compelled to think, manifeſt Hypocrites, and thoſe that trample the Sacraments under their feet, will make profeſſion of ſorrow for ſin: and *Eraſtus* thinketh ſuch are not to be admitted: *Eraſtus* ſaith, *they may change their purpoſe of Repentance, and ſo may he doe himſelfe. Valeat totum,* granting all, that is, nothing to us, for any Divinity we have proofe of in *Eraſtus* his booke; I ſhould humbly conceive when he ſpeaketh ſo ignorantly of the work

Whom Eraſtus excludeth from the Sacraments

Pag. 114. 115.

Page 117.

Page 116.

Page 207.

worke of Repentance, and preparations for the Lords Supper: he hath been a man *non rectè institutus*, not well instructed, and so without the lists of the disputation by his owne word, and so not to have beene himselfe to be admitted to the Sacraments.

Some on earth must try who are to be admitted to, or debarred from the Sacrament, who not.

2. Nor is it in *Beza* his head onely, that those who desire the Sacrament have true piety, for Christ saith, *Wicked men are known by their works*; otherwise if tramplers of the Sacrament, and the ignorant desire the Sacrament, as ignorance is neighbour to arrogance and presumption: let *Erastus* give us a rule in the Word by which they are to be debarred, all his arguments will prove that they are to be admitted: and if *Erastus* deny that the judgement of men either of Church or Magistrate is to be interposed in the excluding of those who are, *non rectè instituti, not rightly instructed, and doe not professe sorrow for their sin*, he must speake against sense, if he grant some must judge, who are ignorant, and openly impenitent; then I say to *Erastus* what hee saith to *Beza*, *your opinion dependeth on the opinion and judgement of men.* 3. If God have not commanded either Elders, or any other (as *Erastus* saith,) to examine and judge, who are fit for the Lords Supper, who not: Then seeing *Erastus* saith the prophane, the ignorant, the impenitently scandalous, knowne to be such, are to be debarred. I aske of *Erastus*, to whom Christ hath commanded the tryall of this, who are ignorant, and *non rectè instituti*? Men cannot debarre themselves from the Sacraments in a judiciall way, most of men conceiting well of themselves, rush upon the ordinances of God, not knowing that they doe evill: Workers of iniquity, who cry, Lord, Lord, Adulterers, Theeves, Idolaters, who dare come to the Temple of the Lord and cry, *The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord are these*, Ier. 7. 9, 10, 11. will also fast and professe Repentance, *Esa.* 57. 3, 4, 5. even when their wickednes *testifieth to their face against them* in the eies of all, *Ier.* 2. 1, &c. *Ier.* 2. 34. *Esa.* 1. 9. and they will desire to partake of the Lords Supper, as is evident, *Esa.* 57. 2. Now there are none on earth, neither Elders, or any any others to debarre them; *Erastus* saith, *Taceo jam, quod Deus non præcepit vel Presbyteris, vel aliis tale examen.* Let *Erastus* answer us in this, and by what charity is *Erastus* obliged to beleeve, all that seeketh the Lords supper, do it in truth? God has given to us mens works, not their words, of which hypocrites are

Pag. 254. *Pendet hæc opinio tua, ex opinione & judicio hominum.*

Page 254.

liberall, and shall we foment hypocrisie, and mens eating their owne damnation, under *Erastus* his pretence of *incouraging, and not suffocating seeming godly desires*? Lastly, *Erastus* saith, *it doth not concern the Church, that the man deferre to do that which Christ commands him to do*, this is to beg the question. Doth Christ command a man *to eat his owne damnation*?

CHAP. XIII. Quest.9.

Other Arguments for Excommunication vindicated.

Erastus li. 3. ca.9. pag.254.

ERastus. *The Apostle writeth, if any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be accursed:* Ergo, Paul *will have the Elders to sit and judge who truely repent, who not, that they may admit the one to the supper, not the other; if this be excommunication, excommunication is grounded on a thousand places: to love Christ is to keep his commandements,* Ioh. 13. *and* 15. *then who ever saith those that keep not the commandements of Christ, are cursed of God, he shall this way excommunicate: then* Moses *did often excommunicate. But because the false Apostles did strive to make* Paul *contemptible, therefore* Paul *saith, God be judge which of us loveth Christ, and let God destroy him who loves him not, this is the true meaning.*

Ans. Erastus perverteth the sense of *Beza* his words, for *Beza* has no such conclusion as to prove a formall excommunication by the Elders, or Church judicature; this is *Erastus* fained conclusion.

Beza de presbyt. pag 97.

Beza inferreth from these words, that there is here *gravissimæ excommunicationis species*, a kind of heavy excommunication, *materially, to be eternally separated from Christ, called the great excommunication.* And it was to be accursed while the Lord come; and therefore this may prove there is a kind of lesser excommunication, in the Church, and *Moses* his cursing by way of preaching, may well inferre, that because there be Church censures, therefore there is a Church cursing heavy, and lesse heavy. But *Beza* intendeth not to prove excommunication by the Church from this, *but only that Christs enemies are cursed, though they be other wayes in the Church;*

and

and this kinde of excommunication, of ſhutting impenitent ſinners out of heaven, is in a thouſand places of ſcripture, and nothing can hence be concluded againſt *Beza*; and the like excommunication is *Gal.* 1. And when *Ioh.* 2. Ep. forbiddeth to receive a falſe teacher into your houſe, if he be a member of the Church, he is to be farre leſſe kept in Chriſts greater houſe the Church, but is to be caſt out.

Eraſtus. *When* Paul *ſaith*, Gal. 5. *I would they were cut off who trouble you; he ſaith not, conveene the Elders, and caſt ſuch men out of the Church, or deliver them to Satan, but he wiſheth that they were cut off by God.* Pag. 255.

Anſ. 1. The place, *Gal.* 5. 12. *I wiſh they were cut off that trouble you*, is expounded by *Piſcator* of cutting off from the viſible Church; Yea he ſaith, conveene the Church, when he ſaith, v. 9. a little leaven leaveneth the whole lumpe, that is, a little falſe Doctrine infecteth the whole Church, and v. 10. *I am confident of you, that ye will be no otherwiſe minded; but he that troubleth you ſhall bear his judgement, who ever he be*: then he hopeth well of the *Galathians* that they will be of one mind to judge, and caſt out the falſe teacher, this is parallel to 1 *Cor.* 5. though *Paul* do not ſo right downe chide them for neglect of Church cenſures, as he doth 1 *Cor.* 5. The place *Gal.* 5. 12. vindicated.

But ſaith Eraſtus, *if* Paul *wiſhed them to be cut off that troubled them, why did he not cut off thoſe falſe teachers, and deliver them to Satan?* Eraſtus *anſwereth, it was not Gods will ſo to do, and the Apoſtles could not in every place and at every time kill miraculouſly; but when it was profitable, and neceſſary.* Pag. 255. 256.

Anſ. Then *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 5. farre leſſe could rebuke the *Corinthians*; becauſe they prayed not that the inceſtuous *Corinthian* might be miraculouſly killed by *Paul*: for *Paul* had not power to kill him; becauſe it was not neceſſary, nor profitable: the man repented, and was never killed. 2. Iudge if it be probable that *Paul* would wiſh to work a miracle in killing falſe teachers, when it was neither profitable, neceſſary, nor ſafe for the Church to have them killed. 3. *Paul* was confident the man *who troubled them ſhould beare his judgement*. *Eraſtus* ſaith, it was not Gods will he ſhould be miraculouſly killed; *Ergo*, it was not miraculous killing, but ſome Church cenſure; or then *Eraſtus* muſt find out another kind of judgement.

And

And why (may some say) doth not *Paul* write to Excommunicate him, as he did the incestuous *Corinthian*? *Beza* Answereth, *Paul would not* 1 Cor. 5. *take that Authority to himself, but would do it by the suffrages of the Church: So here he sheweth what he desireth, but happily it was not expedient that they should be presently cut off*: So *Beza*: Yea, the words do well bear, that *Paul* thought fit, *That they should bear their Judgement who had troubled them*, and that that leaven should be purged out. 2. Yea, if this cutting off be miraculous, it is clear, *Paul* could not Communicate it to others, for it was *Pauls* will that the incestuous *Corinthian* should *be delivered to Satan* by the suffrages of the *Corinthians*: Nor do we read that the Apostles wished to cut off men miraculously, but were not able to do it.

Pag. 97. de Presbyterio.

Pag. 255. 256.

Erastus. *It is false, That* Paul *willed the man to be delivered to Satan by the suffrages of the* Corinthians: *For he saith* ἤδη κέκρικα, *I have already Concluded, Ordained, Decreed, to deliver him to Satan, though I be absent in body: What then would he have done? he would all the Church being gathered together (not some* Presbyters *only) by his own spirit, and the power of the Lord Iesus granted to him, deliver the man to Satan, that he might strike fear and terror on others, and that the man might bear the just punishment of his wickedness.*

Ans. *Paul* chideth them, that they *were puffed up, and mourned not*, that the man might be put out of the midst of them: Then, whereas it might be said, we want the presence of the Apostle *Paul*, and his privity to the business: To this *Paul* saith, *ver.* 3. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι, *For me* (saith he) *I have, as if I were present in body When you are Convened together, &c. Judged to deliver such a one to Satan.* Now that this Decree was the judiciall Decree and sentence of *Paul* as a miraculous Magistrate giving sentence judicially, when *Paul* himself was absent, and had not convinced the man, nor spoken with him, I do not believe; 1. Because, though κρίνειν may signifie such a sentence of a man when the guilty is before him, yet the word doth not necessitate us to this Exposition, *Luk.* 19. 22. *Out of thy own mouth will* I *judge thee*; for it doth as often signifie a simple act of the minde, and the opinion of any not sitting in judgement, as *Act.* 13. 46. *Ye judge your selves* κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς *unworthy of life Eternall*, 1 Cor. 2. 2. I *determined* ἔκρινα *to know nothing but Christ*,

Paul did not judicially condemne the incestuous man.

Christ, Luk. 7. 43. ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας, saith Christ to *Simon the Pharisee* who was not on the bench, *Thou hast judged rightly*, Tit. 3. 12. *I have determined there to Winter*, 1 Cor. 10. 15. *Iudge ye What I say*, Act. 27. 1. *When it was determined to sail into* Italy. 2. We do not read that Apostle, Prophet or Iudge, gave out a sentence of death against any, the person condemned not being present nor heard: the Lord himself did it not to *Adam*, nor to *Sodom*; he came down to see, he examined *Adam*: *Moses* did not so condemn the man that *gathered sticks on the Sabbath day*: *Joshua* convinced *Achan*, the Prophet convinced *Gehazi*, ere he smote him with Leprosie, *Peter* convinced *Ananias* and *Saphira* to their faces, ere he killed them, so did *Paul* convince *Elimas* the sorcerer in his face, so did Christ in his miraculous purging of the Temple, convince them that *His Fathers house should be a house of Prayer*. Now *Paul* here giveth a judiciall sentence of death on a man, he never spake of being at *Philippi* whence he wrote, and the delinquent at *Corinth*, if we beleeve *Erastus*. 3. *Erastus* judgeth that *Paul* knew this man to be penitent, and how knew *Paul* this? It must be a miraculous knowledge, by which *Paul* at *Philippi* looked upon the mans heart at *Corinth*, one of the greatest miracles that ever *Paul* wrought: for *Paul* had the knowledge of the mans sinne only by report, v. 1. ὁλῶς ὃ ἀκούεται it is reported; between *Pauls* writing the first verse of that Chapter, and his writing the third verse there must interveene a miraculous discovery of the incestuous mans heart, *Paul* being at *Philippi*, and the man at *Corinth*; and *Paul* knowing the man to be penitent, and because of his penitency (as *Erastus* saith) *Paul* did not kill him: Yet *Paul* so farre absent, must have given out a miraculous sentence, as a miraculous Magistrate. *I* (saith he) *by revelation as having the sword of God now in my hand, have judged, and given out sentence, that this man shall be miraculously killed by Satan, before your eyes, that all may feare, and do so no more, and yet I know him to be penitent, and that he shall not be killed by Satan*; a monstrous and irrationall sentence, if it be said, that by report *Paul* had knowledge of his sinne, and by report also he had knowledge of his repentence, and that his spirit would *be saved in the day of the Lord*, and that this knowledge came not to *Paul* by any immediate revelation. I answer, Yet the sentence must stand by *Erastus* his mind touching κέκρικα. *I have judged and condemned*

condemned him as a miraculous Magistrate to dye upon a report, though I never heard him, and I know he shall not dye for this fault: for can it be said, that *Paul* retracted a sentence which he gave out as the deputy of God, and he even then, when he wrote the sentence, knew there was so much repentance in the man, as he would for it be moved not to kill him. 4. There is no ground in the Text, why *Paul* should be said to seek the naked presence of the whole people, to do such a miracle before them, he being himselfe absent; for there is more then a naked presence of the *Corinthians*, as only witnesses that they might be affraid & do so no more: for they were present as instructed with the spirit of *Paul*, *and the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one to Satan: as the words bear*, v. 4. ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος, σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. For to be conveened in the name of Christ, being spoken, *Mat.* 18. v. 20. of a Church meeting, or in reference thereunto in the same phrase, and to be conveened with the power and spirit of *Paul*, and of the Lord Iesus, cannot agree to *Paul*; nor can it be said, I *Paul absent in body, and present in spirit, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and with my spirit, and the power of the Lord Jesus, have decreed to deliver such a one to Satan.* For, 1. the Grammer of the words cannot beare that, for (*being conveened in the name of the Lord, with my spirit*) are constructed together in the Text. 2. It is no sence, nor any Scripture phrase. I *present in spirit, and with my spirit have decreed to deliver such a one to Satan.* 3. It is evident that *Paul* would, as it were absent, recompence his bodily absence, with the presence of the spirit, and road of Church censure, which the Lord had communicated to them. 5. *Erastus* needeth not object, that there was a conveening of the Church, not of some Elders, for as there is no word of the word Elders in the Text, so is there no word of ἐκκλησία in the Text, and so the debate will be, what is meant by συναχθεῖσες whether Elders, or people, or both; but though every one in their owne place were understood, *yet the words beare a juridicall convention, being conveened in the name of the Lord Jesus, and with my spirit, and the power of the Lord Jesus.*

Erastus. *The questions* Why Paul *did not command to excommunicate the false Apostles in* Galathia *? Or why he did not miraculously kill them? are both urgent; But the latter is most urgent, for the*

power

power of miraculous afflicting men, was given to few men, and to Apostles: But it is a wonder, if excommunication was ever, and every where to be observed in all Churches. Yet Paul *neither practiseth it here, nor else where, nor commandeth others to practise it; now here he desireth they may be cut off, but not excommunicated.*

Ans. We say the last is no question, you never read in the New-Testament, or in the Old, that Prophets or Apostles consulted, or advised with the people, whether they should work miracles or not: 2. Though Excommunication was an ordinary power, as the power of *binding and loosing given to the Church, Matth.*16.19. and 18.18. *Ioh.*20.22,23. Yet the actuall exercise of Excommunication, being the highest and weightiest censure, and the most severe of any other on earth, it is no wonder that *Paul* be as sparing and rare in the exercise of it, as the Apostles were in killing mens bodies. 3. It is a begging of the question, to say, *Paul* neither practised himself, nor commanded others to excommunicate, for he did both.

Erastus. *That which is,* Rom.16. *spoken for eschewing of those who cause offences, is that every one (single person beware of false Teachers; it is not spoken to the Church to Excommunicate those false Teachers, and therefore there is no such need of such a Presbytery as you dream of, but only of good and diligent Ministers, who may rightly instruct, and prudently teach their hearers, what Teachers they ought to eschew.* Pag.256. 257.

Ans. 1. The eschewing of false Teachers is a generall, and a duty no question given to all and every one of the Church: But the place doth no more say in expresse terms that a single Pastor should give warning particularly by name, that this man, *Iohn, Hymeneus, Alexander*, are those false Teachers to be eschewed, then it saith, that the Presbytery, which we assert, doth in expresse termes, shew what false Teachers they be, who by name are to be Excommunicated and eschewed; but you see, that *Erastus* is overcome by truth, so far, as he must say one single Minister may declare that such a false Teacher, by name, is to be eschewed as *a Heathen and a Publican*, and so in effect excommunicated, and put out of the Church; but he denieth that the Church may declare him a Heathen, as *Matth.*18. and that many Elders, *συναχθέντες gathered together in the name of Christ*, as it is, 1 *Cor.*5. may put out a false Teacher, To eschew the scandalous is materially to Excommunicatethem.

Teacher, or a wolf out of the flock. 2. We grant that it is spoken to every one, that he should eschew false teachers, yea, and 2 *Thes.* 3. *All that walketh unordinately, all fornicators, extortioners, drunkards,* 1 *Cor.*5. But that every man should eschew those, whom he in his private judgement conceiveth to be such, before he rebuke them, and labour to gain them, and in case of obstinacy, *Tell the Church,* as Christ commandeth, *Matth.*18. is not commanded, but forbidden, *Matth.*18. *Lev.*19.17. *Col.*3.15. For if this should be, that I might immediatly, upon my own private grudge, unbrother and cast out of my heart and intire fellowship, every one whom I conceive offendeth me, and *walketh unordinately,* without observing Christs order, or previous rebuking of him, I make a pathway to perpetuall Schismes: 2. A violation of all Laws of fraternity, and Christian Communion. 3. A dissolving and breaking of all *Church Communion,* and it were strange, if *Erastus* will have Christs order kept, *Matth.*18. in private offences done by one brother to another, and not in publick offences, when a brother offendeth twenty, and a whole Church, as if I were obliged to seek to gain my brothers soul in private and lesse injuries, and not in publick, and more hainous offences.

Tit.3.10. Ioh 2.10. Hence it is clear to me, I*f we are to reject an Heretick, after once, or twice admonition, and not to receive in our houses false Teachers,* and 1 Tim.6.3. *If any teach otherwise, and consent not unto the wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Iesus Christ, being given to perverse disputing, as men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth,* 1 *Tim.*6.3,4,5. *We are to withdraw our selves from such, and to save, with severity and plucking out of the fire,* those that cannot be cured; then certainly the *Church of Christ* must also turn away from such men, and acknowledge them as no members of the body, whereof Christ is the head; if we say not this, if one hath leave in a constituted Church, to judge and condemne his brother, and then we shall not take the course of the Apostles in the like case, as *Act.*15. which is not Apostolick, for when false Teachers troubled the Brethren, they would not peremptorily, though great Apostles, as *Paul* and *Barnabas,* determine against either the false doctrine, or the persons of the Teachers, while the *Apostles, Elders,* and *Brethren* did meet in a Synod, and determine against the Error, and against the men, as such *as troubled the Brethren with*

Words

words, and perverted their souls, Act. 15. Now *Erastus* is willing to acknowledge a sort of Divine Excommunication, not a humane, as he is pleased to call that Ordinance of separating of wicked men from the Church and *holy things of God*, which yet was in the *Church of the Jews*, instituted by Christ and his Apostles, and which no Church wanted, as learned *Beza* saith, even in the time of persecution: had *Erastus* explained to us his divine Excommunication, as he calleth it, it were easie to bring most of his owne Arguments with greater strength of reason against it then against ours, which is the truely divine Excommunication.

CHAP. XIV. Quest. 10.

Whether Erastus *doth strongly prove that there is no Presbytery, nor two distinct judicatures, one of the Church, another of the State?*

ERastus. *I deny not, First, such a Presbytery, as the Evangelists mention, which is called a Presbytery, a Synedry, a Synagogue; this was the civill Magistrate who had amongst the Jews the power of the sword.* 2. *I deny not a Presbytery,* 1 Cor. 6. *when the Church wanteth a civill Magistrate.* 3. *I deny not a Presbytery of learned men, who being asked, may give their judgement of doubts: of which* Ambrose, *there was nothing of old done* sine seniorum consilio, *Without the Counsels of the Elders. But I deny a Senate, collected out of the body of the Church, to judge who repenteth, and are to be excommunicated, and debarred from the Sacraments, and who not; or I deny any Ecclesiasticall judicature, touching the manners and conversation of men, different from the judgement or court of the civill Magistrate, or that there be two supream Courts touching manners in one Common wealth.* Erastus l. 4. c. 1. c. 2. p. 258. 259. What Presbyteries Erastus yeildeth.

Ans. One simple head in a moment, may deny more then many wise men can prove in a whole day, it proveth they are more cumbersome in their disputes, then strong; that there was a Iewish Presbytery, that is, a civill judicature, is confuted by *Lev.* 10. 10. where there is a Court of *Aarons* sonnes, whose it was to judge

of Church matters only, *and to put difference betweene holy, and unholy, betweene cleane, and uncleane.* 2. A Presbytery of arbitrators in matters civill, to keep Christians from going to law one with another, before heathen judges: Is not a Presbytery, 1 *Cor.6.* one wise man might do that, and he is no Presbytery. 2. There is no judicatures of Officers there; they were but gifted men arbitrarily chosen for a certaine businesse, and were not judges, *habitu.* 3. A Presbytery for Doctrine only is further to seek in the word, I hope, then our Presbytery; *Erastus* should teach us where it is. 4. He denieth a Presbytery for manners, then all scandals must come before the civill Magistrate. Who made him a Church officer to judge of the affairs of the Church? Who is to be admitted to the seals, who not? For two supream Courts, I shall speak God-willing.

Pag.259. Erastus. *There is no Colledge of Presbyters at* Corinth, *but every man was to judge himselfe.*

A Presbytery at Corinth.

Ans. There is a company gathered together *in the name of our Lord Jesus With the spirit of* Paul, *and the power of our Lord Iesus,* 1 Cor.5.4.5. *Who did judge those that are within, and put out from amongst them an incestuous man,* v. 12, 13. *least he should leaven the whole Church,* v. 6. this is a Colledge of judges. 2. There is a number of builders and labourers with God, 1 *Cor.* 3. 9, 10, 11, 12. Ministers of God, dispensers of the misteries of Word and Sacraments of God, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. such as *Paul, Apollos, Cephas*, and others, 1 *Cor.*1.12,13. 1 *Cor.*4.6. A number that had power to punish, to forgive, 2 *Cor.*1.2,6,7,8,9,10.3. A number of Prophets who judged of the Doctrine of the Prophets, 1 *Cor.*14. 30,31,32. these be very like a Colledge of Presbyters. O but *Paul* writeth not to those, but to those who were puffed up, and mourned not, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. These were the people and Church. *Ans.* Yea these were the eyes, eares, and principall parts of the Church, 1 *Cor.* 12. 14,15,16, 17,18. now he writeth to the Church, 1 *Cor.*1.1,2.

Erastus. *Before this time*, Paul *must have instituted this Presbytery, Who seeth not that this is false? for so he would have accused the Presbytery, not the Whole Church; but he accuseth not the Elders, because they admitted the man to the Lords supper, and there is no Word of excommunication here. There is no mention of one judgement, of one election, of one office, but he chideth the Whole Church; because*

they

they mourned not: it was not the Elders office to remove this; they dream, who say there is a Presbytery instituted here, and there was none instituted before this Epistle was written; he biddeth them not ask suffrages, whether he should be excommunicated or no.

Ans. All that *Erastus* saith against a Presbytery, is to improve excommunication: But there may be excommunication by the people, as many hold, where there be no Elders at all. 2. Let *Erastus* point out the time, when a number of preaching Prophets were instituted at *Corinth*, whether in this Chapter (which to me is a dream) or before. 3. He had cause to rebuke all; All were secure, the Elders who cast him not out, the people who said not to their Elders, as the *Colossians* are bidden say, *Col.* 4. 17. to *Archippus*; and will *Erastus* say that preaching Elders, who by office, are the eyes of the Church, 1 *Cor.* 12. 17, 28. were not to be chiefe in mourning to God, and praying that the man might be miraculously killed? and yet he reproveth all equally. 4. He reproveth them all that the man was not cast out of the Church, and this includeth a reproofe, that he injoyed all the Church priviledges, especially the Sacraments. 5. It is false that there is no mention of judgement, v. 12. Do not ye judge those that are within? for election, there is none in the Chapter, nor any Presbytery instituted in this Chapter; it was before: *Erastus* hath the like reason to say, that there was no instituted Church at *Corinth*, because in the 1. or 2. Epistle to the *Corinthians*: we reade not where he instituted any such Church; if we finde the thing instituted, we know it had an institution, and let *Erastus* shew us when *Paul* received the institution of the Lords supper, from the Lord: shall we deny he received any such thing contrary to 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. because we finde not where and how he received from the Lord? 6. There is no asking of suffrages mentioned *Act.* 1. at the chooſing of *Mathias*, nor *Act.* 6. at the chooſing of the Deacons that we reade of; *Ergo*, there were no suffrages there; it followeth not. 7. And ought not farre rather suffrages to have been asked before the people should take on their heads the mans blood, by consenting thereunto, and praying for it, as *Erastus* saith?

Erastus. *If these words*, v. 3. *I verily as absent in body, but present in spirit, have decreed*, &c. *signifie, choose out of your company*, Presbyters, *who are to censure the manners of the people, who shall debarre the*

the unworthy from the Sacraments, I am willing to suffer any thing.

Anſ. I know no man but *Eraſtus* that dreameth of any ſuch ſenſe, there is no inſtitution of a Presbytery in this Chapter, no calling of Miniſters; but it preſuppoſeth a miniſtery before ſetled. But if theſe words, I have decreed, *&c.* have the *Eraſtian* ſenſe, I have given ſentence as a Magiſtrate, that the man be killed by the miniſtery of the Devil; and that you ſhall be my Heralds to proclaime this ſentence: it is a wonder the Text give not any hint of ſuch a ſenſe.

Pag.261. *Eraſtus*, v. 12. he ſpeaketh not of the judgement of *Presbyters*, but of all the people.

Eraſtus granteth an examination of ſuch as are to be admitted to the Sacraments, but denieth all excluſion. Pag.261.

Anſ. 1. This *Eraſtus* on his word aſſerteth, without probation: We deny it, it is but parallel with Gods judging. 2. It is an act of the keys. 3. It is relative to caſting out by thoſe that are conveened in the name of the Lord Ieſus, with the ſpirit of *Paul*, and the power of our Lord Ieſus: Was every Girle, and beleeving ſervant capable of this ſpirit, and power?

Eraſtus. *I grant before any come to age, be baptized, he is to be examined, whether he underſtand the Doctrine of faith, and aſſent to it with his heart: I grant it is profitable that young ones be examined, before they be admitted to the ſupper, but I deny God hath for either of thoſe inſtituted a Presbytery. But there is no ground that a Presbytery muſt try wicked men, ere they be admitted to the Lords ſupper.*

Anſ. 1. We owe *Eraſtus* thanks for granting this; but what if the aged be found groſly ignorant, and uncapable of the ſeals? and ſome wicked men will trample the ſeals as ſwine, and yet they deſire Pag.207. the ſeals. *Eraſtus* ſaid before, ſuch ſhould not be admitted; who ſhould debarre them; either the Church of beleevers, or thoſe that are over them in the Lord, or the Magiſtrate muſt debarre them: if the firſt and ſecond be ſaid, *Eraſtus* cometh to finde ſome uſe for a Presbytery; if the Magiſtrate be an heathen, he cannot examine or debarre any from the ſeals. Let *Eraſtus* anſwer, if he be a Chriſtian, how can it be denied; but if the Magiſtrate by his office is to ſteward the bread to one of the children, not to another, but he is a ſteward to cut and divide the word, and ſeals both aright; and how could *Paul* make it one of the properties of the Paſtor, 2. Tim. 2. *to cut the Word*, and by the ſame reaſon to diſtribute the ſeals aright, if it depend upon another officer by his office to command

mand him to divide it to this man, whom he hath examined, and findeth in his mind qualified, and not to this man? We judge the Elders of the New Testament do agree in this common and perpetuall morality, that both are to put difference between clean, and unclean, holy, and unholy, though many things were unclean to the Iews, that are not unclean to us, and that the Church hath yet a power to bind and loose, *Mat.* 16. 19.

Erastus. *There was never a wiser common wealth in the World, then that of the Iews*, Deut. 4 *But in the Common wealth of the Iewes, there were never two distinct judicatures concerning manners*: Ergo, *There should not be these two different jurisdictions in the Christian common wealth. But all should be given to the civill Magistrate.* Page 262 lib. 4.

Ans. Erastus is seldome happy in his Logick, his Syllogismes are thin sowne, all Gods laws are most wise, but if this be a good Argument, was not their Church, their Religion, their Ceremonies, their judiciall Laws, all wise and righteous? Then the Christian Church should be conform yet to the Iewish, we should have those same bloody sacrifices, judiciall lawes, Ceremonies that they had. The Iudicatures and officers are positive things, flowing from the positive will of God, who doth appoint one jurisdiction for them, most wise, and another to Christians different from them, and in its kinde, most wise. 2. We give two judicatures in the Church of the Iews, concerning manners, one civil, acknowledged by *Erastus*; another spirituall & Ecclesiastick, ordaining Ecclesiastick and Spirituall punishments upon the unclean, *Lev.* 10. 10. As to be removed out of the campe; and such like, and *Deut.* 17. *Thou shalt come to the priests, the Levites, and the Iudge, that shall be in those daies, according to the sentence which they of that place (which the Lord shall chuse) shall shew thee, and thou shalt observe to doe according to all that they informe thee*, ver. 12. *And the man that will doe presumptuously, and will not hearken* הַכֹּהֵן *to the Priest, (that standeth there to minister before the Lord thy God) or unto the judge,* אוֹ אֶל הַשֹּׁפֵט *even that man shall die, and thou shalt put away evill from Israel.* There is here an evident disjunction that clearly holdeth forth, that both the Priests and the civill judge judged in matters of manners, and that he that presumptuously despised the sentence of either was to die: a judicature of the Priests is evidently

The places Deut. 17. and 2 Chron. 19 do prove two different judicatures.

vidently here, and a judicature of the civill judge, *Erastus* cannot deny, and that the Priest judged in subordination to the civill judge, is refuted by the words, which saith the Priest was immediatly subordinate to God, not to the Magististrate: He that will not heare the Priest (*that standeth to minister before the Lord thy God*) shall die: *Ergo*, He is the Minister of the Lord; and God called and separated *Aaron and his sonnes, to stand before the Lord, and to minister, and he did call the Levites, the Magistrate called them not to office.*

Page 262. Erastus. Bezi *saith, that* Moses, Iosh ua, David, Salomon, *did not execute the office of the Priests, and therefore the charge of the Priests, and of the civill Magistrates were different offices, and charges; but I said, before the Lord chose Aaron and his sonnes to be Priests, they were not so distinct charges, but they did agree to one and the same person; for,* Moses *to omit the rest, did execute the office of Aaron,* Lævit. 8. *But after that it was not lawfull for any to doe the office both of King and Priest; and therefore* Saul *and* Vzziah *were justly corrected of God for it. But what is this? It proveth not that the Priests had publike judicatures to punish wickednes of manners.*

How the Kingly and priestly office are different.

Ans. Certainly, if *Erastus* deny the charge of the Priest and the King to be different offices, because once *Moses* did offer Sacrifice, (and so was *Melchisedeck* both a King and a Priest, *Heb.* 7.) he must say that *Moses* offered Sacrifices, *Levit.* 8. not as a Priest. (Sure I am, *Moses* was a Prophet, and a Prince and Ruler, but no Priest.) But *Moses* by *Erastus* his way, must as a civill Magistrate have offered Sacrifices, and not as a Priest or priviledged person by a speciall and an extraordinary commandement of God; for to deny the two offices of Priest and King to be different offices, because one man discharged some Acts proper to both Offices, as *Moses* both did beare the Sword of God, as a Prince, and did also discharge some Acts proper to the Priest, as *Erastus* saith he did, *Leviticus* 8. is a poore and naughty Argument: undeniable it is that *Melchisedeck* was both King and Priest, but even then to be a King and to be a Priest, were two distinct offices, in nature and essence, because *Melchisedech* did not take away the life of a Murtherer, as a Priest, but as King of *Salem*, *Heb.* 7. 1. Nor did *Abraham* pay tithes to *Melchisedech* as to a King, but as to a Priest. Tithes in *Moses* Law as tithes, were never

ver due to any but to the Priests: and therefore even in *Melchisedeck*, the Kingly and Priestly office, were formally distinct Ordinances of God, just as *David* as a King and judge took away the head of the man who brought *Sauls* head to him, and not as a Prophet he did this; so as a Prophet he penned the Psalmes, not as a King: If one and the same man be both a Musitian and a painter, he doth paint excellently as a painter, not at a Musitian, and he singeth excellently not as a Painter, but as a Musitian; and though one and the same man doe acts proper to both, that may prove that Musick and the art of painting are one subjectively onely, that they may both agree to one and the same man, but not that they are not two faculties and gifts of God different in specie and nature. 2. Though *Erastus* confesse that it was unlawfull *that* Vzzias *and* Saul *should sacrifice*, yet he will have the Kings office, and the Ministers office under the New Testament not so different; for he said expresly, *Who knoweth not now when* Aarons *Priesthood is removed, but we are all equally Priests?* Saul *and* Vzziah *sinned when they were bold to sacrifice and burne incense, but the Magistrate doth not therefore sin, who exerciseth the charge of the Ministery, if he might for his businesse performe both, doth* Paul *make exceptions of Magistrates and Potentates, when he saith,* 1 Cor. 14. *You may all prophecie?* Hence he must grant that the civill Magistrate now may both preach, baptize, and administer the Supper of the Lord, and therfore not only hath the Church no Senate, nor Ecclesiasticall court to punish faults, and scandals with Ecclesiastick censures; but there is no *Presbytery of Elders* to give their judgement in matters of doctrine, for the Magistrates and all Christians *may as well prophecy by* 1 Cor. 14. *as Ministers, saith he*, yea the faculty of preaching is no more proper to the Ministers of the Church, then to the Magistrates of the city. Now by this nothing is proper to the Magistrate, as the Magistrate, but to the Magistrate as a Christian, and to all Christians. But *Erastus* contendeth that the government of the Church, and punishing of Scandals, which we say belongeth to those that are over the people of God in the Lord, and to Church Rulers, doth belong to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, and *virtute officii*, by vertue of his office: so that if any Iew or Turke, or any ignorant or extreamely scandalous should attempt to intrude himselfe upon the Seals,

Lib. 3. c. 1. page 175. *Erastus* denieth the Ministery to be a peculiar ordinance to some onely, but common to all under the New Testament.

the Magistrate as the Magistrate and *virtute officii*, is to examine and judge if he be unworthy, & to debar him, or as he findeth him worthy, admit him to the Seals. Now any seeth that it is but a deceiving of the Reader, to say that one man may discharge both the place of the Magistrate, and the Minister of God, as *Moses* did, and *Ioshua*, & *David*: For let *Erastus* and his followers shew us roundly and down-right, whether or no prophecying, debarring the unworthy from the Seals, and all acts of Church government, not proper to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, and *virtute officii*; And if so, (as indeed *Erastus* teacheth) it is but a poore shift to say, that one and the same man may both exercise the part of a Magistrate, and of a Minister.

Erastus. Bezi *for ever shall not prove that there was a Church judicature, that had power to punish scandalous men.* Iehoshaphat 2 Chron. 19. *ordained judges in all the fenced cities, and admonished them of their duty.* 2. *And did the same at Ierusalem.* 3. *And ordained judges of Levites and Priests, and heads of families, for the judgement of the Lord, and for every cause; and* Amaziah *the High Priest was chiefe in the causes of the Lord, and* Zebadiah *in the Kings causes. This Synedrie at Ierusalem was the politick Magistrate, they judged of stroaks, servitude, deaths. But your Synedrie judgeth not between blood and blood, it judgeth not of every cause,* as Deut. 17. *Those that are not well versed in Scripture, are to note two things:* 1. *That* the cause of the Lord, *where mention is made of judicatures, is not onely a cause of Religion, but any cause proposed in judgement, especially the causes of the Widdow, the Orphan, & oppressed, which the Lord saith he will avenge.* 2. *The Levites & Priests were no lesse civil judges then others: it is known that onely the Levits were Magistrats in the cities of refuge, there was need of men exercised in the Law of God, that the judges might judge righteously.*

Page 263. 264. Two distinct Iudicatures, 2 Chron. 19.

Ans. If you take punishing for inflicting Church-censure, (as we here take it) then all the places that sayes *the Priests pronounced the Leper clean or unclean, to put out of the campe, or take in,* to judge of the adulterous woman, of the restitution made by those for whom they offered Sacrifices, *to judge between the clean and unclean*; to hold out of the Sanctuary the unclean, the uncircumcised in heart and flesh, *Levit.* 13. 3, 4, &c. and 20. 22. and 21. 26. and 30. 44. and 31. 50. *Ezek.* 22. 26. and 44. 8, 9, 10. *Num.* 3. 6. and 5. 18, 19. *Deut.* 17. 12. say the Priests had power to punish

niſh for tranſgreſſing of Gods Lawes, and where the Prophets complaine of the Prieſts miſ-government and unjuſtice, it is preſuppoſed they were to govern juſtly according to the Law, *Ier.* 5.31. 2 *King.* 12.4. *Ier.* 26. 7, 8, 11. *Hag.* 2. 11, 12. *Ezek.* 44. 8, 9, 10. 2. For the place 2 *Chron.* 19. it is evident that *Iehoſhaphat* doth reforme both Church and State, and brought the corrupted Iudicatures to that which they ſhould be by Law; and *v.* 5,6,7. *He ſet judges in the fenced cities of Iudah*: Here is the civill judicature. And *v.* 8. *Moreover in* Ieruſalem *did Iehoſhaphat ſet of the Levits, and of the Prieſts, and of the chiefe of the fathers of Iſrael, for the judgement of the Lord, and for controverſies, when they returned to* Ieruſalem. Now that this ſecond is a Church judicature, I am confirmed, 1. Becauſe *Iehoſhaphat* appointed civill *judges in all the fenced cities of Iudah*; *Ergo*, Alſo in *Ieruſalem* the prime fenced city: Now this civill judicature was not tyed to a place, but was in every city, even all the fenced cities; but the Synedrie of *Prieſts, Levites and Elders* was onely at *Ieruſalem*, in the *place that the Lord ſhould chuſe, Deut.* 17. 8. Hence a judicature tyed to no city, but which is in every fenced city, 2 *Chron.* 19.5. *Deut.* 17.8. and a judicature tyed to *Ieruſalem, the place that the Lord did chooſe, Deut.* 17. 8. 2 *Chron.* 19. 8. muſt be two diſtinct judicatures, but ſuch were theſe. 2. There is a (*moreover*) put to the Iudicature at *Ieruſalem*, וגם *and alſo in Ieruſalem did* Iehoſhaphat *ſet of the Levites*, &c. This could not have been ſaid, if this had not been a judicature different from the former, for if *Iehoſhaphat appointed Iudges in all the fenced cities*; *Ergo*, He appointed them firſt at *Ieruſalem*, the Mother city and fountaine of juſtice; now then he ſhould ſay the ſame thing needleſly, and with a *moreover*, if this judicature at *Ieruſalem* were not a judicature Eccleſiaſticke and different from the judicature civill, that he appointed at *Ieruſalem* as one of the prime fenced cities, which was common with the civill judicatures in other fenced cities. 3. The perſons in the judicatures are different, for *v.*5. the members of the court, 2 *Chro.* 19. 5,6,7. are called שופטים judges; theſe could not be Churchmen, for of theſe he ſpeaketh *v.*8. & they are expreſly diſtinguiſhed from *the Levites, Prieſts and Elders*, v. 8. who are all Church-men, for the fathers of the people were no other thing then our governing Elders, and theſe were members of the other court, *v.* 8. 4. The

objects of these judicatures are very different. The Spirit of God saith of the one *ver.* 5. That they judge for the Lord, *ver.* 13. *for all the Kings matters*, this must be all civill causes, in which the King, and inferiour judges under the King doe judge; but the object of the other is higher. The Priests and Levites are appointed by *Iehoshaphat for the judgement of the Lord*, ver. 8. *And in every matter of the Lord*, *v.* 13. Now whereas *Erastus* putteth a note of ignorance on all that hath been versed in the Old Testament before him, whereas he confesseth he understandeth not the *O*riginall Language, let the Reader judge what arrogance is here, *Where ever there is mention* (saith he) *of judgement, there is signified not religious causes, but also other causes, especially the cause of the widow and Orphane*: It bewrayeth great ignorance. For, 1. *The matters of the* Lord, *and the matters of the King*, are so evidently distinguished, and opposed the one to the other, by two divers presidents in the different judicatures, the one Ecclesiasticall, *Amaziah the chiefe Priest, in every word or matter of the* Lord; *and the other* Zebadiah, *the sonne of* Ishmael *the ruler of the house of* Iudah, *for all the Kings matters*, that the very words of the Text, say that of *Erastus* which he saith of others, *that he is not versed in the Scripture*: for then *the causes of the* Lord, and *the causes of the King in the* Text, by *Erastus* should be the same causes, whereas the Spirit of God doth distinguish them most evidently. 2. If the cause *of the King*, were all one with the *judgement of the* Lord, and *the cause of the* Lord, yea, if it were all one with all causes whatsoever either civill or Ecclesiasticall, what reason was there they should be distinguished in the Text? and that *Amaziah* should not be over the people in the *Kings matters*, though he were the chiefe Priest, and *Zebadiah* though a civill Iudge over all the *matters of the* Lord, and causes Ecclesiasticall? 3. The Kings matters are the causes of the widow, and orphan, and oppressed, as is evident, *Ier.* 22. 2. *O King of Iudah*, v. 3. *execute yee judgement and righteousnesse, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, and doe no wrong, doe no violence to the stranger, the fatherlesse, nor the widdow*, so *Esa.* 1. 10. 17. *Prov.* 31. 4, 5. *Iob* 29. 12, 13, &c. Then the Text must beare that every *matter of the King* is the Iudgement of the Lord, and the matter of the Lord; and every matter and *judgement of the* Lord, is

דבר לכל המלך

also

alſo the matter of the King, and to be judged by the King, then muſt the King as well as the Prieſt, judge between the clean and the unclean, and give ſentence who ſhall be put out of the Campe, and not enter into the Congregation of the Lord, no leſſe then the Prieſts. Let *Eraſtus* and all his ſee to this, and then muſt the Prieſts alſo releeve the fatherleſſe and widdow, and put to death the oppreſſour. 2. The different preſidents in the judicatures maketh them different judicatures. 3. It is denied, that all cauſes whatſoever came before the Eccleſiaſticall Synedry at *Jeruſalem*, *Eraſtus* doth ſay this, but not prove it; for the place 2 *Chron.* 19. doth clearly expound the place, *Deut.* 17. for the cauſes of the brethren that dwell in the Cities, between Blood and Blood, between Law and Commandement, Statutes and judgements are judged in the Eccleſiaſticall Synedrim at *Ieruſalem*, not in a civill coactive way by the power of the ſword. 1. Becauſe all cauſes are by a coactive power judged, as the matters of the King, the ſupream ſword bearer, 2 *Chron.* 19. 5. v. 13. *Rom.* 13. 4. to eſchew oppreſſion, and maintain juſtice, *Ier.* 22. 2, 3. But the cauſes here judged in this Synedrim, a re judged in another reduplication, as the matters of the Lord differenced from the matters of the King, 2 *Chron.* 19. 13. now if the Prieſts and Levites judged in the ſame judicature, theſe ſame civill cauſes, and the ſame way by the power of the ſword, as Magiſtrates, (as *Eraſtus* ſaith) why is there in the Text, 1. Two judicatures; one, *v.* 5. in all the fenced cities; another at *Ieruſalem*, v. 8? 2. What meaneth this, that the Kings matters are judged in the civill judicature, not by the Prieſts and Levites? (as *Eraſtus* ſaith) for the Ruler of the houſe of Iudah was preſident in theſe, and the matters of the Lord were judged by the Prieſts and Levites? and *Amariah* the chiefe Prieſt was over them? for then *Amariah* was as well over the Kings matters, as the Ruler of the houſe of *Iudah*, and the Ruler of the houſe of *Iudah* over the Lords matters, as over the Kings; for if Prieſts and Levites judged as the Deputies ſubordinate to the King, and by the power of the ſword, the Kings matters are the Lords matters, and the Lords matters the Kings matters, and *Amariah* judgeth not as chiefe Prieſts, as he doth burne incenſe, but as an other judge, this truly is to turne the Text upſide downe. 2. The cauſes judged in the Synedrim at *Ieruſalem*, are ſaid to be

judged

judged as controversies, when they returned to *Ierusalem*, 2 *Chr.* 19.8. and matters too hard, between plea and plea, between blood, and blood, between stroke and stroke, *Deut.* 17.8. and so doubts of Law, and cases of conscience. Now *Mal.* 2.7. *The Priests lips should preserve knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hostes*, and this way only the Priests and Levites judged, not that they inflicted death on any; but they resolved in an Ecclesiasticall way, the consciences of the judges of the fenced Cities, what was a breach of the Law of God Morall or Judiciall, what not; what deserved Church censures, what not, who were clean, who unclean; and all these are called the judgement of the Lord, the matters of the Lord; because they had so near relation to the soul and conscience, as the conscience is under a divine Law. 3. *Erastus* saith, it is knowen that the Levites only were Magistrates in the Cities of refuge, but I deny it; *Erastus* should have made it knowen to us from some Scripture: I finde no ground for it in Scripture.

Pag. 265. Erastus. *It is true, that* Beza *saith, that the Magistrate hath a supream power to cause every man do his duty. But how hath he that supream power, if he be also subject to the Presbyters? for your Presbyters do subject the Magistrate to them, and compell him to obey them and punish them, if they disobey.*

Ans. The *Magistrate* even *King David* leaveth not off to be supream, because *Nathan* commandeth him in the Lord; nor the King of *Niniveh* and his Nobles leave not off to command as *Magistrates*, though *Jonah* by the word of the Lord bring them to lie in sackcloth, and to Fast; all the Kings are subject to the rebukes and threatnings of the Prophets, *Isa.* 1.10. *Jer.* 22.2,3. *Ier.* 1.18. 2 *Kin.* 12.8,9.10,11,12. 1 *Kin.* 21.21,22,23. *Isa.* 30.33. *Hos.* 5.1,2. and to their commandments in the Lord: If Presbyters do command as Ministers of Christ, the highest powers on earth if they have souls, must submit their consciences to the Lords rebukings, threatnings and Commandment in their mouth: *Court Sycophants* say the contrary, but we care not. 2. *But they punish the Christian Magistrate* (saith he) *if there be any Church Censure*, as we suppose there is, this Objection should not have been made against us; because of the *Magistrates* supremacy; it doth conclude with equall strength, that Pastors should use it against no man: Now there

there be some swine that trample the Sacraments, some not well instructed in the grounds of Christian Religion; and *Erastus* said, pag.207. *Such should not be admitted to the Lords Supper*: Now the *Magistrate* the *King* is such; Let *Erastians* say, the Pearles of the Seals of the Covenant are to be given to no swine, except the swine be *Magistrates*, and that which *the Church bindeth on earth is bound in heaven*, except it be the *Magistrate*; *Erastus* saith, he may go to Hell by priviledge of his place; and that whose sins the Elders of the *Church retaineth are retained*, except it be the Kings sins, and that we are to put shame upon scandalous persons, and to refuse to *eat with them*, *Romanes* 16.17. 2 *Thess.* 3.14, 15. 1 *Cor.*5.11. 2 *Ioh.* 10. Except they be Magistrates; Sure *God is no accepter of persons*.

Erastus. *Whereas you say, it is not lawfull for the Magistrate to preach and administer the Sacraments, (if he might because of his businesse be able to discharge both Offices) it is not true: God hath not forbidden it; it was lawfull in the Old Testament, for one man to discharge both, why is it not lawfull now also? the history of* Eli *and* Samuel *is known; it is nothing that you say, that the tribunall of* Moses, *was distinguished from the tribunall of* Aaron: *for God gave to* Aaron *no tribunall at all, different from the tribunall of* Moses, *he never did forbid the Priests to sit in the Civill judicature after the captivity, the Priests judged the people* Ezech.44. Pag.265.

Ans. That it is lawfull for the Magistrate to preach and Administer the Sacraments, 1. Destroyeth the Ordinance of Pastors, and a sent and called Ministry under the New Testament, against the Scriptures, *Heb.*5.4. *No man taketh on him this honour to himself, except he that is called of God, as was Aaron: So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made an high Priest, &c.* 2. God often maketh an honour of a calling to the Ministery, that he hath separated them to it, Numb.16.9. *Moses* saith to *Korah*; hear now ye sons of Levi, *Seemeth it a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel to bring you neer to himself to do the service of the tabernacle of the Lord*, Deut.10. 8. *At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister unto him*, Numb.8.6.7.8.9. But that same honour is put upon the Preachers of the Gospel, Rom.1.1. *Paul the servant of Iesus Christ, called*

Magistrates are not to dispense the word and Sacraments as Erastus saith.

called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospell of God, Act. 13. 2. *The holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them*: If it be an honour, and no man, though gifted as Christ was, can take honour to himself: No *Magistrate* can take on him to discharge the office of a Minister.

Object. *But when he is called to be a Magistrate, he is called to be a Minister, and so being called to the one, he is called by the same calling to the other.*

Ans. If being called to be Magistrate, he be also called to be a Minister, then being called to be a Minister, he is called to be a Magistrate, and *Hoc ipso* that he is a Minister, he may usurpe the sword, and usurpe the Throne and the Bench: But Christ being sent to be a Prophet, and to preach the Gospel, *Esa.* 61. 1. *Luk.* 4. 20. 21. ver. 43. refused to divide the inheritance, and to be a a Iudge, *Luk.* 12. 13, 14. He would not take on him to be a judge, except God had made him, and called him to be a judge; If any say the Magistrate, being the supream place, containeth eminently all inferior offices, as to be a Minister, a Lawyer, a Physitian, *&c.* but the inferior does not containe the superior, I Ans. Then the Magistrate being called to be a Magistrate and King, he is called to be a Priest to burn incense, which the Lord condemned in his word, in *Vzzah*; then when *Saul* is called to be a King, he is called to be an Astronomer, Lawyer, Physitian, Sayler, Tayler: Now God giveth a spirit to be a King, but no gifts to those offices; *Ergo*, No calling thereunto, for no gifts argue no calling of God. 2. If a man called to be a judge, be also by that same calling, by which he is made a judge, made a Minister, then it is all one to be called to be a judge, and to be a Minister; and so a Magistrate as a Magistrate doth preach and administrate the Sacraments, then 1. All Magistrates should preach and administrate the Sacraments, and *Nero*, and heathen Magistrates are gifts, *actu primo*, given by Christ ascending on high, for the edifying the body of the Church, *Ephe.* 4. 11, 12.

Obj. It is not sinne to him to preach and administrate the Sacraments; but then he cannot have time for both.

Ans. If God lawfully call the Magistrate to preach the Gospel, woe be to him, if he preach not, he should lay aside all other imployments and preach, God never gave a talent and calling to any

to

to preach, but he ought to lay aside other things, and imploy that talent to the honour of God, otherwise he sinneth in digging his Lords talent in the earth, whereas he is obliged to make five talent ten. 2. If he preach as a Pastor not as a Magistrate, then he hath another calling of God to be a Pastor, and another to be a Magistrate, and certaine it is, as a Magistrate he doth not preach; because there be farre other qualifications required in a Magistrate, as *Deut.* 1. 12. that he be wise, and understanding, and knowen, and a man of truth, hating coveteousnesse, *Exo.* 18. 21. But there is farre other qualities required in a Bishop, 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2, 3. *Ergo*, it is one thing to be called to be a Minister, and another to be called to be a Magistrate. 3. In all the word, Christ never commanded the Magistrate to preach and baptise; this negative Argument *Erastus* useth often against us, to prove that none ought to be excluded from the Sacraments, because Priests, Prophets, Christ, Apostles never excluded any: But Christ commanded the Ministers to preach and baptise, and gave them the Holy Ghost for that effect, and sent them as the father sent him, as having received all power from the father, *Math.* 28. 18, 19, 20. *Mark.* 16. 15, 16. *Ioh.* 20. 20, 21, 22. and least we should think this charge was given to *Apostles* as *Apostles*, he teacheth that it is given to all faithfull Pastors to the end of the world; *Math.* 28. v. 20. *Lo I am with you, even unto the end of the world, Amen.* Not to say, that if it be peculiar to Apostles to preach and baptise, neither Pastors, farre lesse Magistrates can do it, or then Pastors and Magistrates are Apostles sent to preach to all the world, and can work miracles, which is absurd. 4. Christ ascending to heaven, left *Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors* and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, and work of the Ministery; not Kings and Magistrates. 5. How shall they preach, except they be sent? Magistrates as Magistrates bear the sword, and have carnall weapons, and are not sent; the weapons of Ministers are not carnall, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. For *Erastus* his Argument, God has not forbidden Magistrates to preach; *Ergo*, it is lawfull for them to preach, it followeth not; for such positive ordinances as preaching Ministers, must be appointed by a positive command, for where hath God forbidden women to baptise? *Ergo*, they may baptise; is not the Lords commanding the Apostles to go teach and baptise all Nations, and his not giving any such commandement to others, as

good as a forbidding of them? But I hope this is examined already sufficiently. 2. For *Samuel* his being both Iudge and Propher, I grant it; but as an extraordinary dispensation of God, which Christ would not take on him to do, *Luk.*12. nor is it left to us as a rule. 3. That *Aarons* sons had no tribunall of their owne different from the tribunall of *Moses*, is proved to be false from 2 *Chr.*19,8. 4. That the Priests were Magistrates having the power of the sword, cannot be proved by any word of God, the place *Ezec.*44. is every way for us, all the power given in that Cha. is Ecclesiastical, none Civill, *as to keep the charge of the Lords holy things, to exclude the uncircumcised in heart and flesh, out of the sanctuary, to come near to the table of the Lord and Minister*, v. 16. *to enter into the gates of the inner courts, clothed in linnen*, &c. and many the like, did no more agree to a Magistrate then to burn incense, which to do, *Erastus* granteth was unlawfull in King *Vzziah*; yet he would prove that it is lawfull under the New Testament to exercise both, so the Magistrate were able to do both; because *Samuel* exercised both. But might not King *Vzziah* exercise both without impeachment of his businesse? and where was he forbidden? but in this God made choise of the tribe of *Levi*, and of no others, which also he has done under the New Testament. as is proved.

The Magistrate is not to judge who are to be admitted to the Sacraments, who not.

Erastus. *Nor is that true, that Whose part it is to preach and dispense the Sacraments, it is his part to judge of those that prophaneth the Word, and seals, so as he has power to punish any that desires the Sacraments, With the Want of the Sacraments; and though it were true, it should prove that Pastors, not a Presbytery of Pastors and Ruling Elders have any power to debarre from the seals.*

Ans. 1. Well, then *Erastus* granteth that the Ministers are to preach the Word and dispense the Sacraments: But not to judge of those that prophane the holy things of God, nor to debarre from the Sacraments any who desire them; if *Erastus* did mean a bodily debarring by the power of the sword, if any openly prophane shall violently intrude himself, we should yeeld that to the Magistrate as the keeper of both Tables. But *Erastus* is of that minde, that as the Magistrate may preach and dispense the Sacraments, he may by that power also Ecclesiastically *cognosce*, and judge of the scandals, for which the openly prophane are to be debarred, and accordingly debarre. Now *Erastus* saith he may preach

as

as a Christian, because that all Christians now under the New Testament may preach and prophecy, all are Priests and Prophets, so saith he, page 175. So the Magistrate by this as a Christian, and so all Christians women and children, may try and examine all that are openly prophane, and unworthy of the Seals: this can be nothing but popular Anarchy; yet that the Magistrate, as a Magistrate, and not as a Christian, is to examine and try who are unworthy communicants, I conceive is the minde of *Erastus*, as I have proved before: Which though it be a plaine contradiction, yet it is the pillar of all the *Erastian* doctrine, that the *Magistrate* as the *Magistrate* hath the supream power of all Church governement. *Therefore* (saith he, page 171.) *they doe wickedly who take from the Magistrate that part of the visible jurisdiction in governement of the Church which God hath given to him, and subject the Magistrate to some other jurisdiction,---- Magistrates are Gods.*

L. 3. c. 1. *ex equo nos omnes esse sacerdotes.*

Erastus ib. 171.

Ans. If to preach, dispense the Sacraments, and to judge who are unworthy of the Seals, and debarre them, be taken from the Magistrate as he is a Christian, this power of visible jurisdiction over the Church is no more taken by us from the Magistrate, then it is taken from all Christians as *Christians*, and in regard of any such power Magistrates are no more Gods and Nursefathers in the Church, then all Christians are Gods and Nursefathers of the Church: for by the reason of *Erastus*, p. 175. *that all Christians now are Priests and Prophets*, and so may examine who are worthy of the seals, who not, then the Civill Magistrate can be, by us, spoyled of nothing that God has given him, as a Magistrate, except *Erastus* say that he doth all these as a Magistrate & *virtute officij*; which when he or any of his Disciples shall assert, beside that it is contradictorious to his way, we are ready to demonstrate that it is blasphemous & contrary to the word of God. But that *Erastus* does take from the Elders of the Church, and give to the Magistrate a power to judge in an Ecclesiasticall way, who are to be debarred from the seals, I argue on the contrary thus; those who are to cut the word, and distribute it aright, are also to distribute the seals aright, to the worthy, not to dogs and swine, not to heathens and publicans, for it is evident that the right stewarding and distributing of ordinances doth essentially include the stewarding of them, with judgement and discer-

ning, to those that are worthy, not to those that are unworthy. But Elders, not Civill Magistrates are to do the former, *Ergo* the latter also. 2. Those to whom Christ committed the power of the keys to open and shut, to bind and loose, to those he hath given the use and exercise of the keys. But Christ gave the power of the keys to the Apostle *Peter*, as representing the Rulers of the Church, *Mat.*16.19.& to the Church, *Mat.*18.18. and not to the Magistrate as to the Magistrate; *Ergo*, The proposition I prove from the Texts, *Mat.* 18.18. *What ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven*, &c. and Cha. 16. 19. the same is repeated: now actuall binding is the use and exercise of the keys given to *Peter* and the Church. But it is presumed the power is given, when Christ saith, v.19. I *will give unto thee, the keys of the Kingdome of Heaven.* 2. We read not that God giveth a power, a gift, a talent, or an office, but he judgeth it a sinne in those to whom he giveth it, not to put forth in acts and in exercise that gift, talent, and office, either by themselves, or his deputies; which latter I speak for the King, who in his own person, and in the person of inferiour judges sent by him, do put forth in acts of justice, the Royall power that God has given him. The assumption is Scripture.

Erastus has no answer to this, *but the keys were given to* Peter *as representing all the faithfull, not the Elders, and that all private Christians do bind and loose.*

Ans. Besides, this is answered fully above, and is a meer anarchicall Democracy; it, 2. concludeth well that Christ gave not to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, the keys, but to the Magistrate as he is a Christian, making that same Christian confession of faith with *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. and as he is an offended brother, who may bind and loose in earth and heaven, so *Erastus Thes.* 54. p.42. and so by this the Magistrate hath no more power to debarre from the seals, then all other Christians have. 3. If Christ give the key of knowledge to the Elders, then he cannot give the power of studying Sermons, and preaching the word to another; so if Christ give the power of breaking the bread of life to the children of the house, then he cannot give the power of judging, who are the children of the house, who not, to another.

Ob. *But the Magistrate is only to examine the fact, & to punish adultery, incest and the like, that deserve to be punished by the sword, but not*

Whether

Whether it be a scandall that deserve exclusion from the Sacrament, or not; *Ministers are to take the probation of the scandalous fact by Witnes from the Magistrate, & so to exclude from the Lords supper, and to deal with the mans conscience to bring him to repentance, so do some argue.*

Ans. If the Church be to try the penitency, or impenitency of the fact, and not to *cognosce* and try whether he hath done the fact, upon the same ground the Magistrate is to try and punish the disturbance of the peace of the Common-wealth, that adhereth to the fact, and not to try the fact. 2. It is not possible that the Church can know whether the man be penitent, or no, except by witnesses they know the fact, for they shall run a preposterous way, to work the man to a godly sorrow, for that sinne which possibly he never committed; now that of which the Church is to convince the man, and from which they are to gain his soul, that they are to find out. 2. This is against the way of *Erastus*, who will have the Magistrate to exclude from the Sacraments, and none other. 3. The word knowes no such thing, as that Ministers should be led in the acts of their Ministeriall duties, to whom they should dispense the mysteries of the Gospel, and to whom they should deny them; by the Magistrate? by as good warrant the Magistrate is to lay a tye on the consciences of Elders, what they should dispence, as to whom they should dispense; sure if the Magistrate as the Magistrate must prescribe to Ministers, to what sort of persons they must dispence word and Sacraments, he must upon the same ground as a Magistrate prescribe what Doctrine they should preach to this man, not to this, whether Law or Gospel; and so the Magistrate as the Magistrate must be a Pastor to cut the word aright, 2 *Tim.* 2. 15. *Eze.* 3. 18, 19, 20. *Eze.* 13. 19. to command to preach life to this man, death to this man. 4. If the Church must cast him out, and judge him who has done this wickednesse, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2, 12. and 4. 5, 6, 7. then must they judge of his scandall; that according to the quality of the scandall, they may proportion the measure of the punishment; *Ergo, a pari* they must judge whom they debarre from the seals. 5. The debarring any from the seals, must be proportioned to the end of all spirituall censures, that the man be gained, and his sinne loosed in heaven, *Mat.* 18. 15. 18. *that his soul may be saved in the day of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. *That he may be ashamed*, and so humbled, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14, 15. 2 *Cor.* 2. 6, 7. that he may learn not to blaspheme, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20.

1.20. But the Magistrates excluding of any from the Sacraments is no mean congruous to such an end, for he can command nothing, but the disobedience of which he can and ought to punish with the sword; now a carnall weapon cannot be congruous and proportionable to a spirituall end. 6. If the Magistrate as a Magistrate must so farre have the keys of Discipline, then as a Magistrate he must catechise, examine, and try the knowledge of the Communicants, and so watch for their souls, as those that must give an accompt to God. 7. The Magistrate must have a Negative voyce in all the acts of the Church, and the man must be bound in heaven, but not except the Magistrate will, and looſed in heaven, but not except the Magistrate will, for all must depend upon the consent of him to whom Iesus Christ has committed the supream, and highest and only power of governing the Church; now this is the Magistrate as the Magistrate to *Erastus*. 8. The Magistrate as the Magistrate must forgive sinners and relaxe them from excommunication, 2 *Cor.*2.7. and restore those that are overtaken in offences, with the spirit of meekness, *Gal.* 6.1. and rebuke publikely those that sin publikely, 1 *Tim.*5. 20. and so be a spirituall man, and a Pastor. Neither doth it follow that the Pastors as Pastors only, should debarre from the Communion, though *virtute potestatis ordinis* as Pastors, they are to keep themselves pure, and not to give pearls to swine, nor to communicate with other mens sins; yet because the Sacraments are Church ordinances, they are to be dispensed by the Church, that is, by the Elders with consent of the people: it is one thing to dispense ordinances to those that receive them, and another thing to dispense them *certo ordine* after a Church way, the former is from power of order, the latter from power of jurisdiction, and from the Church only.

CHAP. XV. Quest. 11.

Whether Erastus *do validly confute a Presbytery.*

Answer to the l.4.c.3. of Erastus. p.266. 267 how Erastus confuteth a Presbytery.

ERastus. *What consequence is this?* Lev. 10. *God commandeth* Aaron *and his sonnes to put a difference between the holy and prophane, the cleane and the unclean, this difference they were to teach the people out of the Law*; Ergo, *God hath ordained a Colledge of Ecclesiasticall Senators to exercise the power of the Civill Magistrate? it is like this*; *God commanded the* Pastors *to teach the people, and dispense the Sacraments*; Ergo, *he instituted a Presbytery in place of the Magistrate.* *Ans.*

Anſ. This conſequence is ſo ſtrong (though the conſequent be not ours) to prove a Synedrie, that *Eraſtus* ſhall never be able to refute it; for that the Prieſts might teach the people, they were to judge and governe the people, and were *to judge between the holy and prophane, not onely that the Prieſts might informe* the peoples minds, but that the Prieſts and Levites might, 2 *Chron.* 9. 8. 9 10. *Deut.* 17. 8, 9 give judgement *between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between ſtroake and ſtroake, being matters of controverſie, and hard to be judged* by the inferiour judges; theſe concerned not the inſtruction of the people as matters of opinion, as *Eraſtus* imagineth; but they concerned the governing of the people in juſtice, that *v.* 12. *the man that will doe preſumptuouſly, or will not hearken unto the Prieſt or the judge, ſhall die the death?* Was not this *to governe the people and to judge them?* Certainly *Eraſtus* in the ſame Chapter ſaith ſo, to wit, that there was one common Synedrim of civill judges, Prieſts and Levites at *Jeruſalem*, that the Prieſts and Levites were Iudges in capitall matters, and give out the ſentence of death, *de capite & ſanguine*, and he proveth *page* 270. 271. that the Prieſts were civill judges, and did *give ſentences of blood, of life and death*: *Ergo*, the Prieſts did not diſcerne *between the clean and the unclean, between blood and blood onely*, that they might teach the people, but that they might regulate their owne practiſe in judgement, and govern the people; yea that the Prieſts might pronounce ſome unclean, and to be put out of the Campe ſo many dayes, that they might debar out of the Sanctuary *the unclean, the uncircumciſed, the ſtrangers*, and *Lev.* 10. the end of judging and governing is expreſly ſet down, *v.* 10. and ſo a judicature, and the other end, *v.* 11. *that they may teach the children of Iſrael all the Statutes which the Lord hath ſpoken by the hand of Moſes.* 2. From the *Elders* preaching the Word and diſpenſing the Sacraments, ſimply we inferre no judicature at all, farre leſſe a politick judicature, which we doe not aſcribe to the Prieſts, for *John Baptiſt* both preached the Word and baptized, and yet was no judge, nor did he erect any Church judicature, but from the power of the keyes given to the Church, and exerciſed by the Church, *Mat.* 16. 19. *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, &c. 1 *Cor.* 5. 1, 2, 3. &c. *Revel.* 2. 1, 2, 3, &c. we inferre a Church judicature, we never placed a Presbytery in place of the Magiſtrate; for

Page 271. Page 269. 270.

A Church judicature in the Iewiſh Church Deut. 17.

for it is no more the Magistrates place, then to sacrifice is the place of the Magistrate.

Page 267. Erastus. *I wonder that you seeke your Presbytery in* Moses *Law, all yours, say the Synedrie, Christ speaketh of did rise after the captivity, at least when the sword was taken from the Iewes. They say* David *and* Solomon *did punish vices, they approve* August. 39. quest. in Deut. *that Excommunication doth now what putting to death did of Old, and deny any Excommunication to have beene in the Church of the New Testament.*

Ans. Erastus declares himselfe to be a childe, not versed in Protestant Divines, for we except *Musculus, Gualther, Bullinger*, some except *Aretius*, all our Protestant Divines goe the way *Beza* goeth. 2. Let him produce any of ours, who say that the Synedry that Christ speaketh of, was Iewish, and ours say that Christ alludeth to the Iewish Synedrie: But all (few excepted) that Christ *Mat.* 18. speaketh of the Christian Church to be erected. 3. The Kings of *Israel* punished scandals, but that is not enough, did they governe the Church, pronounce who were clean or unclean? or middle with the charge of Ecclesiastick Government committed to *Aaron and his sonnes*? 4. We say with *Augustine*, that some that were killed of old, are to be Excommunicated now, *Augustine* speaketh not of all, and what is that against us?

Page 268. Erastus. *Not any but your self* (Beza) *say that* Moses *speaketh of these same persons, things, and office*, Levit. 10. *and* Deut. 17. *in* Levit. 10. *he speaketh onely of the Priesthood, and* Deut. 17. *of the Iudges or Magistrats.*

Ans. Beza expoundeth the one place by the other, but he saith not these persons, things and office are in both places. 2. *Erastus* onely contradicteth *Beza*, and saith *Moses* speaketh of the Magistrates, *Deut.* 17. But he is refuted by the *Spirit of God*, 2 Chron. 19. 8, 9. who repeating the very words of *Deut.* 17. saith the Iudges here were *Priests, Levites, and heads of Families*, whom all men deny to be Magistrates.

Erastus. *You say* Deut. 17. *mention is made of blood, of the cause of Pleas, not because the Synedrie judged of the fact, but because they answered the true sense of the Law; I say, whether they answered of the fact, or of the Law, they sentenced judicially of life and death, so that there was no provocation from them to the civill judicature, for*

he

he was put to death, who would not stand to their sentence, but you deny that any politick causes or matters of blood or death, belongs to your Presbytery.

Ans. 1. *Beza* said well the fact, and the putting of the man to death, which is the assumption and conclusion belonged to the civill judge, not to the Priests; But the *quæstio juris*, the *question of Law* belonged to the Ecclesiasticall judicature of *Priests, Levites and Elders*; and it is evident, that it was a case of conscience, concerning a matter, or an admirable cause that cannot be determined by the judges in the city, they not being so well versed in the Law as the Priests, *whose lips should preserve knowledge*, Mal. 2.7. Therefore it is not a fact, that may be cleared by Witnesses, there is not such difficulty in facts, except in adultery, or secret Murthers, the word commeth from פלא to admire, or to be separated from sense and reason, *Lament.* 1. 9. *Gen.* 18. 14. *Is there any thing hard to, or hid from Jehovah?* 2. They are called דברי ריבת *causes or matters of contention*, Vatablus *causa insolita & difficilior*: Our translation hath it, *matters of controversie.* 3. It is said, *thou shalt come and inquire or diligently search out.* 4. *The Priests and Levites shall shew thee the sentence of judgement*, so it is evident that the Priests and Levites did not so much judge, as declare and resolve the law-part of which the inferiour judges did doubt, for the difficulty of the question, as *Saul came to Samuel the Seer, to aske concerning his fathers asses*, and it is true *bloods and stroakes* came under the cognizance of the Priests, but as bloods comes before Lawyers, and those that are expert in the civill Law, in the *Parliament of England and Scotland*, the Lawyers as Iudges put no man to death, the King could say, *fall upon such an evill doer, and kill him*, and the judges and Princes might put to death. But you never read that the Priests, yea or the High Priest said, *fall upon such an ill doer and kill him*, nor was this any Law of God, that the Ecclesiastick Sanedrim, should put to death and politically condemne any man to die, or command any mans blood to be shed, they but declared and resolved a case of conscience to the judges, and a plea, and said, *This is a matter of blood, and deserveth death by the Law of God, and he that hath done such a fact in point of Law, ought to die.* But there were two things left to the civil Iudges. 1. Whether this man hath done such a fact. 2. A sitting in the Tribunall, and

דרש

The Priests put no man to death.

saying, *I or we command and decree such a man who hath shed such blood, hath inflicted such a stroake on this woman who is with childe of living birth, to be stoned to death, to be hanged.* Erastus hath not proved, nor never shall prove that the *High Priests, Priests* or *Levites*, by Gods Law did thus judge any: That *Ananias* commanded *Paul* to be beaten, and the lictors of the High Priest smote Christ on the face at the command of the Priests, was against Law, they had no power so to doe by Law, yea, and our Presbyteries that judge of sorceries, witchcrafts, incests, adulteries, and other capitall crimes, and of bloods in point of Gods Law, what is witchcraft, what is incest, that the husband that striketh his wife being with quick child, and killeth the birth is a Murtherer; but that they judicially say, *such a woman is a Witch, and so ordain her to be hanged and burnt, and such a husband is a Murtherer, and decerne him to die, is utterly unlawfull*, therefore this is an ignorant speech of *Erastus*: *This synedrie of Priests and Levites, whether in point of Law, or in point of fact, did give out sentences of death, therefore they were politick judges*, it followeth not; and that the Priests said, this *man deserveth to die, and therefore they gave out, as civill judges, sentences of death, (for the civill judge draweth not the sword with his owne hand,)* is a foul consequence; for lawyers do say such a man is worthy to die, but it followeth not that Lawyers are civill judges to condemne a man to die; for the Priests said, *this man deserveth to die in point of Law*, not absolutely, as this man, but upon supposition that he hath committed the fact, deserveth to die, and their meaning is, any man whosoever he be, though they never hear, nor see the man who hath committed such a fact, ought to die. Now Gods Law never appointed any judge to condemn a man to die, whom the judge never did accuse, heare, or see, this were extreame unjustice: Now this supposition is, and was to be proved and judged by the civill Iudge; and whereas *Erastus* saith, the *judge draweth the sword with his owne hand against no man*; 1. It is not to purpose, for the hangman is in Law the hand and instrument of the judge, but he is neither hand nor instrument of the Lawyer, of the Priests and Levites, who in matters criminall of life and death, judge of the Maior proposition, and of the Law, except *Erastus* would have a Major proposition to prove an Assumption, which were to shame all Logick: For the Priest never com-

man-

minded this or this man, because he had done this fault, to be stoned by such & such executioners. 2. It is doubtful whether the judge did never with his owne hand, cast a stone at any stoned to death. Lastly, *there was no provocation from the great Sanedrim at Ierusalem*, true, in matter *of Law*, what then? *Ergo*, they were politick judges? it followeth as the like consequences of *Erastus* doth follow. Yea, for the fact and the judiciall condemning of the man, they were neither the highest judicature, nor any judicature at all, the civill Iudges of the high Sanedrim did that onely. It is true, he was to die who would not stand to the sentence of the judge or Priest in the matter of Law, the man being judged to be guilty of the fact by the civill judge, but this shall never prove that the Priests were civill judges.

Erastus. *The late Iewes referre to this Sanedrim at Ierusalem questions of making warre, or consecrating the Priest, of tributes, of charges of the Temple, of judging of Tribes, of the censuring of false Prophets, and of Soothsayers, &c. How then is it not a politick judicature in which all causes belonging to worship, Ceremonies, civill policy, bloods, and capitall punishments were handled? for when* Moses *had spoken of the punishing of Idolaters, he presently addeth* Deut. 17. *If any thing be hard for thee, &c* Page 269.

Ans. It is like enough, the Iewes referred such as these to the *Sanedrim*, but we contend for two *Sanedrims*, one civill, and another of Priests, *Levites and Elders*, who judged of matters onely of Ecclesiasticall cognizance, and of bloods, and punishing Idolaters and false Prophets with death, onely in a spirituall way, in point of Law; and I judge the holy Ghost *Deut.* 17. hath so framed the words that it is evident, as I have proved that capitall crimes belonged to them in point of Law; for he saith not, *he that refuseth to die when the Priests and Levites condemne him to die, hee shall surely die, and have the benefit of appeal to no higher judicature*, Now this he should have said by *Erastus* his way; but *he that will not stand to the sentence of the Priest or judge shall die.* Hence it is clear, he speaketh of things in matters of Law, in which the guilty might dis-assent, and alledge the Priests had not judged according to Law. But how was it the minde of the holy Ghost that any could refuse the Sentence of death given out by the Priests? for the meaning must be by *Erastus* his way, *he that refu-*

seth to die, when the Priest condemneth him to die, he shall surely die. 2. He saith not that the Priests and Levites shall give out sentences of death and blood against any man, but they shall shew and teach thee when thou shalt inquire, the sentences of judgement, even of Idolaters, blasphemers, of Murthers, and blood, according to the Law of God, the knowledge of which the Priests lips should preserve.

Erastus. Moses *instituted no other publike judicatures for punishing* Page 270. *of Wickednes, but those he maketh mention of* Exod. 18. Numb. 11. Deut. 1.16, 17. *But all these were onely civill, not Ecclesiasticall Judges. The seventy that were indued with the spirit of prophecy were given to helpe Moses and ease him, not to be assistants to helpe Aaron, and it cannot be doubted but Moses his government was civill.*

Ans. Both the Major & the Minor is false, the Major is from some particular places, *negativè*, he should argue from all the Old Testament, and he argueth from some places onely, he leaveth out *Levit.* 10. and all the places where the Priests were onely to judge the Leper, the uncleane, which are spirituall judicatures, not civill. 2. The Assumption is false; *Deut.* 17, saith the contrary. 3. Though we could not shew a place for the formall institution of an Ordinance, yet if we show the thing instituted, it is sufficient. 4. *Erastus* much doubteth himselfe, if *Moses* his government was altogether civill, especially before the Lord separated *Aaron* his sons and the Tribe of *Levi* to teach and governe the people in an Ecclesiasticall way, for *Erastus* said before that *Moses* prescribed Lawes to *Aaron*, sacrificed and did that which was proper to the Priests, though after that God forbad the Kings to usurpe the Priests office, and punished *Saul* and *Vzziah* for so doing, (though I never read that *Saul* usurped the Priests office, you may take it upon the word of *Erastus*) and we all know that *Moses* was a *Prophet of God*, Deut. 18. 18. I *will raise them up a Prophet from amongst their brethren like unto thee*, Deut. 34. 10. *And there arose not a Prophet in Israel since, like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face*, Heb. 3. 5. *Moses verily was faithfull in all his house as a servant*: Now those that will say *Moses* his government of the Church was all civill and politicail, as a civill judge and King, and that he acted not in the governement of the Church, as in writing and delivering Laws, and in doing many things, yea in com-

commanding the will of God, as a Prophet to *Aaron*, to his ſons, and the whole tribe of *Levi*, to me ſpeakes non-ſenſe.

Eraſtus. *That judicature to the which the inferiours appealed, as to the ſupreame, is politick.* Page 270. 271.

Anſ. It is denied, they appealed to it, as the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtick in point of Law and Conſcience: *Ergo*, It was not politique, all the reſt are anſwered before, yea, *Iehoſhaphat* 2 *Chron.* 19. putteth this as a thing peculiar to the Prieſts, *v.* 12. *What cauſe ſoever ſhall come before you of your brethren, --between blood and blood, between Law and Commandement, Statutes and Judgements, ye ſhall even warne them that they treſpaſſe not againſt the Lord*; that is, as *Eraſtus* yeeldeth, *ye ſhall teach them what is juſt and agreeable to, and what is unjuſt and repugnant to the Law of God.* Civill judges lips were not to *preſerve knowledge*, as the *lips of the Prieſts*, Mal. 2. 7. *and* Deut. 17. 11. *According to the ſentence of the Law that they ſhall teach thee, and according to the judgement that they ſhall tell, thou ſhalt doe.* Hence it is clear that this judicature in civill things was a teaching, a telling, a declaring and reſolving judicature, and that in blood they reſolved of cauſes of blood, of ſtroakes, but judged not perſons, nor bloody men, nor violent perſons.

Eraſtus. Moſes *and* Iehoſhaphat *ſpeake of one and the ſame judicature.* Moſes *doth not give teaching and commanding diviſibly to ſome, but joyntly to all the Synedrie. Though the Prieſts were more skilled in the Law, for* Moſes *commandeth to teach the ſenſe of the Law by judgeing, as he ſaith himſelfe*, Exod. 18. 16. *I judge between one and another, and I doe make them know the ſtatutes of God and his lawes*; Moſes *putteth them all joyntly together, they ſhall tell thee, thou ſhalt doe what they ſhew thee, according to the Law that they ſhall teach thee ſhalt thou doe, not declining to the right-hand, or to the left-hand.* Page 272.

Anſ. 1. That *Iehoſhaphat* ſpeaketh of the ſame judicature that *Moſes* ſpeaketh of, is clear, 2 *Chron.* 19. 8, 9. 10. The very words of *Moſes Deut.* 17. 8. are the ſame, both the ſame judges, and the ſame cauſes, compared with *v.* 5, 6, 7. But *Iehoſhaphat* maketh two judicatures, as I have proved, and *Iehoſhaphat reformed according to Moſes his Law*, as *Eraſtus* granteth. 2. I cannot be induced to beleeve that *the judges here teached by judging*, it is ſpoken contrary

Teaching and judging not one.

trary to *Theology*: The end of teaching is to informe the conscience, and Teachers as Teachers watch for the soule; and the end of civill and politick judging, is a quiet and *peaceable life*, 1 Tim. 2. 2. *the vveapons of teachers are not carnall, but spirituall*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. the weapons of civill Iudges are carnall, for the civill Iudge *beareth not the svvord in vaine*, Rom. 13. 4. then these same civill judges did not both teach and judge at once, they taught not as civill judges, but as Priests; they judged not as Priests, but as civill Iudges; and therefore there is no ground to say that *Moses ascribeth these same acts to civill judges, and Priests and Levites, as* if they made one *Synedry*; for in both Texts not one word of teaching, which is proper to the Priests, *Mal.* 2. 7. *Ier.* 2. 8. *Hos.* 4. 6. is ascribed to the civill Iudge; and not one word of judging and condemning to death, which is proper to the civill Iudge, *Num.* 35. 24. *Deut.* 22. 18, 19, *Deut.* 17. 2. 3, 4, &c. and 21. 19, 20. 1 *King.* 21. 11. 2 *Sam.* 14. 15. 1 *Kings* 2. 28, &c. *Rom.* 13. 4. *Luke* 12. 13. 14. &c. is ascribed to the Priests and Levites; but the Priest or the judge are set downe by way of disjunction, *Deut.* 17. 12. which could not be if they made one and the same judicature, and therefore *Iehoshaphat* 2 *Chron.* 19. clearely distinguisheth them in two judicatures, one *v.* 5, 6, 7. Another v. 8, 9, 10. having two sundry presidents, and two sundry objects to treat about, to wit, the *matters of Iehovah*, and *the matters of the King*. 3. The place cited *Exod.* 18. 16. confirmeth much our opinion, for *Moses* as a Iudge saith, *vvhen they have a matter, they come unto me, and I judge between one & another*. This he spake as a civill Iudge; and when he saith, *And I make them knovv the statutes of God and his lavves*: This he spake as a prophet, for *Moses* was both a Iudge and a Prophet. Now if all civill Iudges be such mixt persons, as to teach the Stautes and Laws of God, they doe this either as *civill judges*, or as *Prophets*, then there was reason why *Malachie* should have said, *the civill judges lips should preserve knowledge, and they should seeke the Law at his mouth*; for if a civill judge, as a Iudge teach the people, and *watch for their souls*, what marvell then he beare the sword to preserve their bodies, as a Prophet, and not as a Iudge; and if he beare the sword as a Prophet and Teacher, all Teachers must beare the sword: which is against reason and Scripture, and what reason is there, if *Moses* teach as a civill judge, but he may as properly be

The civill Iudge as a Iudge cannot teach.

obliged

obliged in conſcience to teach, and ſo he ſhould ſin if he imploy not his talent that way, as he is obliged to exerciſe the ſword as a judge? and by the contrary, a *Prophet* as a *Prophet* ſhould be obliged in conſcience, as kindly and *per ſe*, to exerciſe the Sword as to preach the Goſpel, for nothing agreeth more kindly to the ſubiect, then that which agreeth to it ἀυτὸ under that reduplication, as it is ſuch; Now this is againſt ſenſe and reaſon, and confoundeth all callings on earth: but if *Eraſtus* grant that *Moſes* judgeth as a civill judge, and teacheth the people the Law of God as a propher, then to make this *Sanedrim* a mixt company both to judge civilly, and to teach as ſpirituall men by office, muſt all the Prieſts and Levites in this Sanedrim be both Prieſts and Levites, and alſo civill Iudges? And all the civill Iudges muſt be both civill judges, and alſo Prieſts and Levites, which is expreſly againſt the Text, that ſpeakes *Deut.* 17. of the *Prieſt, or the Iudge*, as two diſtinct offices, and ſo God muſt have choſen the Iudge no leſſe, then the *Prieſt to miniſter before him.* So, it is falſe, that teaching and judging are copulatively *aſcribed to theſe ſame perſons, and to the ſame judicature*, as *Eraſtus* ſaith.

Eraſtus. *He ſaith* Deut. 17. *he ſhall die Who ſtandeth not to the ſentence of the Prieſt or judge, by Way of disjunction, in regard of divers times, for the Princes or Iudges Were not alWayes the ſame, for often onely the Prieſts governed, and for the ſame reaſon he ſaith not*, Deut. 17. *aſcend to Ieruſalem, but to the place Which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe, for the Arke Was not alWayes in one place, or city; So* Deut. 19. *When he ſpeaketh of the falſe Witneſſe, he ſaith, and they ſhall ſtand before the Lord, that is, before the Prieſts and Iudges that ſhall be at that time. Who vvould thinke that there are here diſtinct and divers Iudicatures?* Page 272.

Anſ. It is a conjecture of *Eraſtus*, that *Moſes* ſpeaketh *Deut.* 17. *of the Prieſt or the Iudge by Way of disjunction, becauſe of divers times, not of divers and diſtinct Tribunals*, for all *Moſes* his time, and *Ioſhua's* time, and for the moſt part, there were both Iudges and Prieſts, and we had rather beleeve the Spirit of God then *Eraſtus*, for 2 *Chron.* 19. under *Iehoſhaphat* at one and the ſame time, there were both civill *Iudges*, and *Prieſts* and *Levites*, and theſe two Judicatures had two different ſorts of cauſes, and two different Preſidents; if then at one and the ſame time the man was to be put

to

to death, who did not ſtand to the ſentence of the Prieſt, though he ſhould ſtand to the ſentence of the civill judge; and ſo if hee was to be put to death, who ſhould ſtand to the ſentence of the Prieſts, and give an outſide of obedience to the Ceremoniall Law, if he ſhould not ſtand to the ſentence of the civill Judge, then were there at the ſame time theſe two ſentences in theſe two judicatures: but the former is true by the expreſſe Law of God; *Ergo*, ſo is the latter: when God ſaith, *Goe up to the place that the Lord ſhall chuſe*, he meaneth *Ieruſalem*, and one determinate place at once, and if *Moſes* had ſaid, *Goe up to the place that the Lord ſhall chuſe; or to ſome other place that the Lord ſhall not chuſe*, then could I inferre well, that at one and the ſame time, they might have gone to either places, or to both places, having two ſorts of cauſes, as there be ever two ſorts of cauſes in the Church, ſome Civill, ſome Eccleſiaſticall. 3. *Eraſtus* ſhould have ſhewen a time when onely the Prieſt as the Prieſt did governe, and there neither was a civill Iudge, nor was that Prieſt who governed the civill judge: If *Eraſtus* ſhew not this, he ſheweth nothing for his owne cauſe, which is to make one confuſed Judicature of civill and Eccleſiaſticall Iudges and cauſes, which the Scripture doth carefully diſtinguiſh. 4. In the place *Deut.* 19. nothing is ſaid againſt us, *but that onely the civill Iudge put to death the falſe Witneſſe*; which is much for us, that though the falſe witneſſe was to ſtand before the Prieſts, and incurre an Eccleſiaſtick cenſure, yet the Prieſt as Prieſt had no hand in putting him to death.

Page 272. 273. Eraſtus. *Sometime the Prieſt vvas preſident in this Sanedrim, as* Eli *and* Samuel, *vvithout a judge; therefore vvhen it is ſaid, the chiefe Prieſt vvas over them in all the matters of the Lord, and* Zebadiah *in the Kings matters, they made not tvvo different Iudicatures; and the high Prieſt and* Zebadiah *vvere both over the ſame Iudicature.* Ioſephus *excellently verſed in the Ievviſh lavvs, ſaith,* antiq. lib. 9. c. 1. *they vvere* ἑ ἑταῖροι *fellovves or companions; then they vvere not in divers Senats. The Levites vvere equally ſervants to both, though it may be the Prieſts were more diligently to goe about the cauſes of God, and the* Iudges *the cauſes of the King.*

Anſ. Were *Eli* and *Samuel* preſidents in the Sanedrim without a Iudge? that is as much as to ſay, *Eli* and *Samuel*, who undoubtedly by the Teſtimony of the Spirit of God were civill Iudges of

of Israel, 1 *Sam.*4 18. and 7.15. and 8.1.7. were Judges without Iudges: I conceive *Eli* was both a *Priest* and a *Judge*; and *Samuel* both a *Prophet* and a *Iudge*; whether *Samuel* was a *Priest* or not, let *Erastus* determine. *Samuel* was of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, not a Priest, though he sacrificed by an extraordinary Priviledge; nor was *Moses* a Priest. 2. I see no reason to say, *Eli* was a *Priest Without a Iudge*, more then to say he was a Iudge without a Priest, for he was both. But this may shew the Reader, that *Erastus* alwayes confoundeth the office of the Priest, and the Civill judge, so as he maketh them not only subjectively one, which God himself did in the person of *Eli*, but also one formally; for as I shew before *Erastus* must say, *Eli* sacrificed as a Iudge, and he condemned ill doers to die & exercised the sword as a *Priest*; & *Samuel* propheſied as a Magistrate, & *Samuel* did judge *Israel* as a *Prophet*; for the *Magistrate* as the *Magistrate* to *Erastus*, doth both the part of a Iudge, of a Priest and Prophet of old, and now of a Pastor and Teacher. 3. It is enough to us that *Amariah* and *Zebadiah* were over diverse causes, in divers Courts, and differenced, 2 *Chro.* 19. in that the one was, *for the kings matters*, the other for *Gods matters*. *Erast.* saith right down, they *were both for these same matters*. But the one was to care more *for the Kings matters*, the other *more for Gods matters*: so *Erastus* is forced to make a difference: But he maketh it in the comparative degree, and the *Spirit of God* maketh the difference in the positive degree: But 1. *Erastus* saith without the Text, *Amariah was to care for the matters of the King, but more for the matters of God*: The Text saith no such thing, but the contrary: he saith, *Zebadiah the Civill Magistrate was to care for the matters of God, but more for the matters of the King*: 4. This is against *Erastus* his his way; which is that the Magistrate hath a supreame principall and only care of Church-Government, and the *Priests* and *Levites*, and *Pastors* and Teachers only, as the servants of the Magistrates, *A & sub Magistratibus*, as *Vtenbogard* speaketh, *from and under the Magistrate*, as the *Vicars*, *Deputies*, and *Ambassadors* of the *Magistrate*; yea, that *Magistrates* teach the people by the Pastors, as by their Vicars, then *Zebadiah* should more diligently care for *the matters of God*, then *Amariah* as the Lord and Master should more care his own business, then his servant should do: 3. *More or lesse* doth not vary the nature of things; then must

Erastus maketh the Magistrate and the Priest or Pastor formally one.

Clar. Vir. Antonius Walens, Tom. 2. pag. 27. Wtenbogardus. *Auraonem subijci Mosi. Magistratus esse instauratores, & directores cultus Dei, secundum verbum Dei, sed Doctores esse tantum religionis Ministros, & Magistratum populum docere per ecclesiæ Ministrum; Ministros autem hec facere à et sub Magistratu.*

the Magistrate Sacrifice, Teach, judge between the clean and the unclean, minister before the Lord as the sons of *Aaron*, and the sons of *Levi*, but lesse diligently. But what calling hath he to any of these Acts at all? Hath the Lord chosen the Tribe of *Iudah*, or the Tribe of *Levi* to minister before him? And by the same reason, the Priests, Levites should do these same things, but more diligently. And again *Amariah* is to use the sword, and to condemne ill doers to death: But lesse diligently, these be pleasant dreams. 5. The *Priest* and *Judges* are *companions*, as *Moses* and *Aaron*: *Ergo*, the one is not Master and the other servant and Deputy, as *Erastus* dreameth, and they are the rather of that in divers Senats. 6. But how proveth *Erastus*, *That the Levites were common Servants both to Priests and Judges?* For though it were so, this will never subject the *Priests* to the Civill Judge, nor confound these two Judicatures: *David* 1 Chron. 26. *divided the Levites, and set them in their courses for service*; *Ergo*, They were King *Davids* servants as King, it followeth not, except *Erastus* prove *David* did not this as a *Prophet*, and that the Lord did not *choose the Tribe of Levi*. But *David* did it as a King, and so all *Magistrates* may appoint offices in the *House of God*, and call men to the Ministry, by vertue of the Magistrates place: But *David*, 1 Chro. 24. distributed the Priests as well as the Levites; *Ergo*, the Priests are servants to the *King*, as well as the *Levites*. But the *Levites* are expresly, 1 *Chron.* 26. given by office, *to wait on the sons of Aaron, for the service of the house of the Lord, for the purifying the holy things, for the shew bread, for the fine flour for meat offerings, and for the unleavened Cakes, and that which is baked in the pan, and for that which is fryed, and for all manner of measures and size, to praise the Lord at morning and night; to offer all burnt sacrifices to the Lord, &c.* In all which no man can say, they were servants to the *King*: For then the *King* sacrificed by them, as by his servants; no Divinity is more contrary to Scripture.

It is true, 1 *Chron.* 26. 30. some of the *Hebronites* were *Officers in all the businesse of the Lord, and the service of the King*. But that is because, *ver.* 26. they had the oversight of the spoile, that the King dedicated to the house of the Lord, for the building of the Temple, and that is called the *Kings businesse*.

Page 274. Erastus. *Jehoshaphat*, 2 Chron. 19. *did not depart from Moses his*

his Law: But we read not, that there were two distinct Iurisdictions commanded and instituted by God.

Ans. If this be a good Argument; all that *David* and *Solomon* did for, and in the building of the Temple in the structure, forme, length, breadth, Cedars, gold, Altars, &c. of the Temple shall be without Warrant; *Solomon* and *David* departed not from *Moses*: But *Moses* spake nothing of the Temple, and a thousand things of Divine institution in the Temple.

But this is our Argument, *Iehoshaphat* did erect no new Iudicatures, but restore those that had their Warrant *from Moses his Law.* But so it is that *Iehoshaphat* re-instituteth two distinct Iudicatures; *Ergo*, The Lord by *Moses* at the beginning did institute these two distinct Iudicatures.

Erastus. *We are not anxiously to inquire what be the matters of God; it is all one with what he said before; ye judge not for men, but for the Lord. The Rabbines, the judgement of Capitall causes is the judgement of souls, the scripture nameth all judgements most frequently, the judgements of the Lord,* Deut. 1. *Ye shall not fear men; for the judgement is the Lords,* Exod. 18. *The people come to me to inquire of God, that is, to seek judgement: Therefore are the Iudges,* Exod. 22. Psal. 82. *called Gods, The matter of God, is any cause expressed in the Law of God, and proposed to the Iudges to be judged; and the Kings matter, is that which properly belongeth to the King.*

Pag. 274. What are the matters of the Lord and of the King, 2 *Chron.* 19.

Ans. Erastus his anxiety to inquire is little, because he cannot Answer: 1. The *matter of the Lord* cannot be all one with this, *Ye judge not for men, but for the Lord:* For the matter of the King, or a point of Treason to be judged, is to be judged *not for men, but for the Lord.* But the Text differenceth between the *matters of Lord, and the matters of the King.* 2. In the former, 2 *Chron.* 19. 5. he speaketh of civill businesse; but the matters of the Lord are such as concern the Law of God, and the true sense and meaning thereof to be proposed to the conscience; and 3. That is a common thing to all causes, that in the manner of Iudging, Iudges are to *look that they do as men in the place of God,* so then as God, if he were judging, would *do no iniquity, nor respect persons, nor take gifts,* as he saith, *ver.* 7. *So neither should men do iniquity, or respect persons in judgement*; and so is it taken,

*Deut.*1.17. Now this clearly is the manner of righteous judgement, and *Modus judicandi*, but the matter of *Iehovah* is *Res judicata*; the thing to be judged, which may be unjustly Iudged: and this *matter of Iehovah* is not common to all causes, but is contradistinguished in the Text, from the *matters of the King*, which in the manner of judging is no lesse to be judged *according to the judgement of the Lord, then the matters of Iehovah.*

4. The *Chalde Paraphrast, Vt inquirat institutionem*, Vatab. *Vt consulat deum.* This is a false interpretation, *That to inquire of God, is to seek judgement from God:* For it is to ask the Lords minde in doubtsome cases; and this they asked from *Moses*, as he was a *Prophet*, not as he was a civill Iudge: except *Erastus* will have the Magistrate of old to give responses, and to have been Oracles by vertue of their Office: which is a clear untruth, *Saul, David, Solomon, Joshua*, though *Kings*, did not give responsals, and answers when they did go to War, or were in doubtsome perplexities. But did ask Counsell at the Priest and Oracle of God and the Ark, 1 *Sam.*15.37. *Iosh.*9.14. *Iudg.*20.27. 1 *Sam.*30.8. and 23.2.4. And by this the *Magistrate* as the *Magistrate* should resolve all doubts of conscience now to perplexed consciences, under the *New-Testament.* 5. The Iudges are called Gods, because they are under-Deputies in the room and place of the great God, not because every judgement of theirs is the judgement, and very sentence of God, and accordiug to that the cause they judge is nothing but the *cause of God*, for they are to judge the *Kings matters*, no lesse then *Gods matters.* 6. For what end *Erastus* speaketh of the *Rabbines* here I know not, I think he knoweth not himself; the man was ignorant of them, and innocent of their language.

Pag.274, 275. Erastus. *I am not against, that the things of God be things belonging to the Worship of God, and the matters of the Kings Civill busines. The Priest must especially take care, that there be no error in Faith and Ceremonies: and this belongeth also to the King, as is clear,* Deut. 17. *So* Zebadiah *is not excluded from Gods matters: Nor* Amariah *from the Kings busines.*

Ans. This interpretation is fully refuted: *Zebadiah* is in the Text, excluded from judging Ecclesiastically, *in the matters of God*, as a *Priest, Levite or Elder.* For if he must judge so, he must either judge

judge as a Priest or Levite, which he was not, or as a Civill Iudge; if as a Civill Iudge, then is he no lesse over the people *in the matters of God*, then *in the Kings matters*: Now the Text could not exclude him from these things which belongeth to his office, and put him in another Sphere, in the businesse of the King, and put such a wide difference between the object of the two men, as the *Kings matters, and the matters of the King of Kings*. The like I say of *Amariah*. 2. The King *Deut.* 17. as King, is to Iudge *according to the Book of the Law*, that he may be a godly King, and fear God, and keep the words of the Law; *Ergo*, he is to teach the people no lesse then the Priest, and to judge between the clean and unclean, and that as King: This no way followeth.

Erastus. *If you please by the matters of God, to understand the causes of appeals, and by the Kings matters, other judgements, I contend not: And because the Priest was better accustomed with the Law of God, then others, therefore the High Priest was set over these, yet so, as* Zebadiah *was over the Kings businesse: But I think the two first, especially the first, the best Exposition: But* 1 Chron. 26. *These same persons are set over both the Kings and the Lords matters.* Page 275.

Ans. Consider how dubious *Erastus* is in his three Expositions to elude the force of the place. If it was the Magistrates place, *virtute officii*, by *vertue of his office* to command the Priests, and to direct them (as *Erastus* and *Utenbogard* say) in the internall and specifick acts of *Sacrificing*, *Iudging between the clean and the unclean*, teaching the people: then the King and the Civill Iudge were by office, to be more skilled in the *Causes of God*, then the Priests, because the Commander and the directer, who may by his office exercise those same acts that he commandeth his servants; yea, and is *by office*, to command him to do thus, in these internall Acts, and not thus, he ought, *by his office*, to be more skilled in these then the servant. I grant, the King Commandeth the Painter, all the morall equity requisite in Painting, that he endamage not the Common-wealth by profuse lavishing of Gold; and in this, it is presumed, there is more Iustice and morall equity by office in the King Commanding, then in the Painter Commanded: But if the King should take on him to Command, *virtute officii*, that the Painter regulateth his actions of art, thus and thus, and direct and Command by his Royall office, as King, that the Painter draw

draw the face of the Image with more pale and white, and leſſe red and incarnate colour; in ſuch a proportion according to art, and not in ſuch a proportion: Then by office the King as King, might paint Pourtraicts himſelf; and behoved by office to be more skilled in Painting then the Painter. Now *Eraſtus* preſuppoſeth, Whatever the Prieſts do as Prieſts, in an Eccleſiaſticall way, (he excepteth Sacrificing and burning incenſe, but for a time) that the King as King may do the ſame alſo; ſo the King as King may teach, give reſponſes in matters of God, and now under the new Teſtament, Preach and diſpenſe the Sacraments, and judge as King, whether Prieſts and Paſtors do right or no; and that not only in order to Civill, but alſo to Eccleſiaſticall puniſhments, as deprivation from their offices, and *debarring from the Sacraments*; Hence it muſt follow, that *Zebediah* ſhould, *by office*, be better skilled in *the matters of God* then *Amariah*, or any *Prieſt*; and by office he ſhould rather be *over the matters of God*, then any Prieſt in the world. 2. Now its clear that theſe ſame things, to *be over men in the matter of God*, and *in the matters of the King*, 1 Chron. 26. proveth nothing, except they be over theſe ſame matters, by one and the ſame power of the Sword, as *Eraſtus* ſaith; *Amariah* the High Prieſt, and *Zebediah* the Civill Iudge, promiſcuouſly were both of them, without excluſion of either, over the people in the matters of the Lord, and in the matters of the *King*; and in the ſame judicature, & by the ſame coactive power of the ſword, as *Eraſtus* ſaith, Prieſts and Civill Iudges were in the ſame judicature, by the ſame Civill power, Iudges to give out joyntly, in a judiciall way, the ſentence of a bloody death, and to inflict a bloody death by the ſame power. 3. It is *Eraſtus* his ignorance of the Originall Text, to ſay theſe ſame words that are 2 *Chron.* 19. 11. are alſo, 1 *Chron*, 26. *ver.* 30, 32. for 2 *Chron.* 19. 11. it is ſaid, *Amariah is over you in all the matters of the Lord*: Hence the matters of the Lord, were the formall object of his judging: But 1 *Chron.* 26. 30. the Hebronites were officers in the *buſineſſe of the Lord*, or, *to the buſineſſe of the Lord*, and ולעבדת *to the ſervice of the King*. Levites might have been imployed in both Eccleſiaſticall and Civill buſineſſe in the Temple, and in the overſeeing of thoſe ſpoiles, that *David* in Wars had taken from the Enemies, and Dedicated for *building the Houſe of the Lord*, which are called the Kings buſineſſe; and the conſtruction, *ver.* 32. is varied

Levites ſometime imployed in Civill buſineſſe.

ried, where it is said, The *Hebronites mighty men of valour*, and so fit for war, were made by *King David*, Rulers over the *Reubenites, Gadites, and the half Tribe of Manasseh for every matter; not in every matter pertaining to God*: The affixum ה is here, *and the affaires of the King*. These Levites seem to be imployed in the war, and are *called valiant men*, which must be some extraordinary case: But otherwise, when *God commanded to number the Children of Israel for War*, Numb. 1. 3. 45. *The Levites were not numbred*, God did forbid *Moses* to number them, because they were appointed for another service, ver. 48, 49, 50. Yet it seemeth in *Davids* time, when there were extraordinary warres, that they were not exempted from the warres, for 1 *Chron.* 21. *David commanded to number all Israel from* Dan *to* Beersheba, and *v.* 6. Levi *and* Benjamin Ioab *counted not, for the Kings Word was abominable to* Ioab; Whence to me it would seem, that in some cases they were counted for warre, so 2 *Chron.* 23. 7. *The Levites shall compasse the King, every man with his Weapons in his hands, and* Iehoiada *the High Priest was their leader*, to establish *Ioash* in his Throne; but the case was not ordinary. Otherwise the Levites were separated from warre and civill judicatures to the *service of the Sanctuary*. *Numb.* 1. 47, 50. and 2. 33. and 3. 9. 12. and 3. 41, 45. and 8. 6. and 9. 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19. and 18. 23. *Deut.* 31. 25. *Iosh.* 14 3. 4. and 18. 7. 1 *Chron.* 15. 15. 2 *Chron.* 8. 14. and 20. 19. and 29. 5, 16, 25, 26. *Ezra* 3. 9, 10. c. 6. 18. c. 8. 29. *Neh.* 8. 7, 9. and 9. 4. *Ezek.* 44. 10. All which places must be answered by *Erastus*.

CHAP. XVI. Quest. 12.

Whether Erastus *proveth validly the power of the Civill Magistrate in matters Ecclesiastick?*

Erastus l. 3. c. 1. Page 160. The power of the civill Magistrate.

BEfore I proceed further, it is needfull to examine *Erastus* his doctrine of the civill Magistrate.

Erastus. *As there is a twofold governing, so of necessity there must be two supreame Governours. God is the governour of the inward man, the Magistrate of the outward man, it is absurd there should be*

be two supream Governours of the same Government, so as the one neither be a part of the other, nor Administer all in the name of the other.

*Ans.*1. Because a man consisteth of a spirituall part, a conscience and soul, and of an externall visible part; in which he exerciseth visible and externall acts of worship; yet spirituall, another, as he is a civill Agent, therefore there is a necessity there be no supream externall Governours under the one supream Lord of Heaven and earth; one that teacheth and informeth the minde, and ruleth by the sword whole man, as he is a part of a civill society, in all his civil actions, and this is the Magistrate; another that governeth him, as he is a member of a spirituall and supernaturall society, and exerciseth externall spirituall actions, in reference to God, & in the subjection of his conscience to him, and this is either a *Priest*, *Levite* or *Prophet* in the *Old Testament*, or *Pastor*, *Teacher* or *Elder* in the *New Testament*: and it is absurd, that there should not be two Governors; one over man in relation to his conscience and walking with God, and his brethren as Members of a spirituall society, called a Pastor or Teacher; another in relation to his civill actions of Peace and justice to his brother, as he is a Member of a civill society, called a *Magistrate*.

Men have need of two sorts of Governours.

2. It is an absurd thing, for *Erastus* to fancie God; and the *Magistrate*, two supream Governors, when the Magistrate is not supream, but a meer Minister and vassall subordinate to God, the only most high. 3. It is as absurd to imagine God hath given no Rulers, Teachers, and guides to govern a man as he is a spirituall Agent obliged to worship God, and to be edified in the faith, but only the civill Magistrate; then hath Christ left no shepherd to his redeemed flock but the Civill Magistrate, and ascending on high he hath left *no gifts, no Pastors and Teachers, for the gathering of the Saints to the end of the World*, when we *shall meet all in the unity of the Faith*; but only the *Magistrate* contrary to Christs end, in ascending to heaven, *Eph.*4.11. *Act.*20.28. 1 *Pet.*5.1,2. and contrary to Christs compassion to souls, who is moved, that his sheep want shepherds; for there souls, rather then *Magistrates*, Matth. 9.36,37,38. therefore the opinion of *Erastus* is like the Divinity of Epicures or unchristian Moralists, who appoint Magistrates to Governe the externall man, but no Teachers to take

take care of their souls, or to lead them to heaven.

Erastus. *As there is one measure by which we measure things of divers natures, as cloath of linnen, of silke, of silver, of gold, and there is one weight by which we measure things weighable, though of most divers natures; so is there one visible dispensation and governing of all visible things, though there be some Lawes for the City, some for the Countrey, some for the Schooles, as there be no necessity of divers rulers, and Law-givers, to the City, to the Countrey, to the Schooles; so is there no necessity that there should be any other then the Magistrate, who should guide things civill and prophane, things of Schooles, and things sacred.*

Magistracie and Ministery, both supream in their onwe kinde.

Ans. This man speaketh rather like a Morall, or a naturall Physitian, then a Divine; the argument were good, if men had no souls, for then they should not need any to watch for their souls, as the spirit of God saith they do, *Heb.* 13.17. and he with one stroak, taketh away Pastors and Teachers, and maketh the King the onely Pastor and Teacher in all his Kingdomes. 2. We know similitudes, especially not warranted with Scripture, proveth nothing, and this may well conclude there should be no ruler at all, nor any Lawgiver on earth, but God only, and let every man do what seemes good in his owne eyes, for Gods will is the only measure and rule of all things. And 3. If all men were to be ruled the same way, it might have colour. But it is knowen, that all Churches, as members of a Common-wealth, are ruled one way, in giving to everyman his own,& in not doing violence one to another; But in keeping peace and policy, as all men do in all societies on earth, and so they have need of Magistrates. 2. Another way they are considered as Members of a society, called from the state of sinne, to Grace and Glory, and so they have no lesse need of teachers for the guiding of their souls, *Mat.*9.36,37,38. *Eph.* 4. 11, 12,13,14,15,16. *Act.*8.31. *Heb.*13.17. 1 *Thes.*5.12,13. 1 *Tim.* 5.17. *Act.*20.28,29. *Math.* 28. 19, 20. *Phil.* 1. 1. and by name of the Elders of the Church, *Act.* 4.5. 23. *and* 11. 3. *and* 14.23. *and* 15.2,4,6,22,23. *and* 16.4. *and* 20.28. *and* 21.18. *and* 22.5. *Tit.* 1.5. and that the Magistrate should rule the house of God, is against the word.

Erastus. *One Common-wealth can have but one supream Magistrate, a body with two heads is monstrous, therefore Papists almost by* Pag. 160. 161. 162.

Erastus alloweth no Government, but Popedome and Monarchy.

this argument, doe appoint one Pope head of the Church. There cannot be two powers of two swords, both supream and of equall power: But the Church power must be subject to the more excellent, the power of the Magistrate. But because he cannot do all by himselfe, he Governeth the Schooles by Doctors, the Cities by inferiour judges, the Church by Pastors, and all according to right and justice, and the word of God, and that where the Magistrate and subjects are Christians; but where the Magistrate is of a false Religion, two different Governments are tollerable.

Ans. 1. This argument destroyeth all *Aristocracy, Parliaments, and Senates*, where many good men have equall power, and so the Common-wealth may not have 70. Heads and Rulers of equall power, which is against the Scripture, which commandeth subjection to every Civill ordinance of man, as lawfull, *Rom.* 13. 1, 2, 3. *Tit.* 3. 1, 2, 3. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. *Deut.* 1. 16. It maketh no Government lawfull, but Popedome and Monarchy in both Church and state. 2. It is to beg the question, that there cannot be two supream powers, both supream in their owne kinde, for they are both supream in their owne sphere: as Pastors dispense Sacraments and Word, without subjection to the Magistrate as they are Pastors; and Magistrates use the Sword without dependence on Pastors, and yet is there mutuall and reciprocall subjection of each to other in divers considerations: Pastors as subjects in a Civill relation, are subject to the Magistrate, as every soul on earth is, and Magistrates as they have souls and stand in need to be led to heaven, are under Pastors and Elders. For if they hear not the Church, and if they commit incest, they are to be cast out of the Church, *Mat.* 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. *Rom.* 16. 17. 1 *Thes.* 3. 14. 15. *If they walk inordinately, we are to eschew their company, if they despise the Ministers of Christ, they despise him who sent them*, Math. 10. 40. Luk. 10. 16. God respecteth not the persons of Kings, and we finding them not excepted, if the preachers of the Gospel be to all beleevers προϊσταμένοι ἐν κυρίῳ *over them in the* Lord, 1 Thess. 5. 12. 1 Tim. 5. 17. call it authority, or no Authority, they have some oversight over the *Christian Magistrate*; and here be two supreams, two highest powers, one Ecclesiasticall, another Civill; nor should any deny *Moses* to be above *Aaron*, as the supream judge; *Aaron* not having the power of the sword, as *Moses* had, and *Aaron* must be above

Moses

Moses, in sacrificing, in burning incense, in judging between the clean and the unclean, which *Moses* could not do. 2. The excellency of the Civill power in regard of earthly honour and eminency in the fifth Commandment, above the servants of God in the Ministry of Christs spirituall Kingdom, which is not of this world, we heartily acknowledge. 3. That the King Preacheth and dispenseth the Sacraments by Pastors, as by his servants, is wilde Divinity: *Pastors* then must have Magistraticall Authority and power of the sword committed to them, as the Deputies and inferior judges of the *Lords of the Gentiles*, which Christ forbade his Disciples, *Luk.*22.25,26,27. For the servant must have some power committed to him from the principall cause in that wherein he is a servant. 4. What reason is there, that where the Magistrate is a Heathen, two Governments, and so two heads in one body should be? for then there is and must be a Church-Government, where the Magistrate is a Heathen, and that in the hands of the Church: if then the Magistrate turn Christian, must he spoile the Church of what was her due before?

Erastus. *The Lord Jesus changed nothing in the New Testament of that most Wise Government in the Iewish Church, now there all Government was in the hands of Moses: I say not, that the* Magistrate *might sacrifice, or do what was proper to the Priests, but he did dispose and order what was to be done by the Priests.* p.162.163.

Ans. Yea, but *Erastus* saith, the Magistrate may dispense word and Sacraments in the New Testament, if he had leisure: Why might he not sacrifice in the Old Testament also? 2. Pastors do by their Doctrine and Discipline, order and regulate all callings in their Moralls of right and wrong, of just and unjust; yet is not the Pastor the only Governour in all externals. 3. If Christ changed nothing of the Iewish Government, we have all their exclusion of men out of the Campe, their separating of the unclean, and their politick and Ceremoniall Lawes, which is unsound Divinity.

Erastus. *Moses Ruled all before there was a Priesthood instituted. God,* Exod.4. Numb.12. *calleth* Aaron *to his office and maugurateth him by* Moses; *nor doth he command him to exercise a peculiar judgement, when he declareth his office to him, and when* Aaron *dieth,* Pag. 164. 165.167.

Moſes *ſubſtituteth* Eleazar *in his place.* Ioſhua *c.* 3, 4 *teacheth the Prieſts what they ſhould doe, and commanded them to circumciſe Iſrael: ſo did* Samuel, David, Solomon, *and in the time of the* Maccabees *it was ſo.*

Anſ. Moſes was once a Prophet and Iudge both; *Ergo*, ſo it may be now, it followeth not, except Moſes as a Magiſtrate did reveale what was the Prieſthood: What *Aaron* and *Eleazer* his ſonnes might doe, by as good reaſon *Moſes, David, Solomon, Ioſhua*, as Magiſtrates wrote Canonick Scripture and prophecied. Then may Magiſtrates as Magiſtrates build new Temples typicall to God, give new Laws, write Canonick Scripture, as theſe men did by the Spirit of prophecy no doubt, not as Magiſtrates; for why, but they might ſacrifice as Magiſtrates, and why ſhould Moſes rather have committed the Prieſthood, and the ſervice of the Tabernacle due to him as a Magiſtrate, ſo to *Aaron* and his ſonnes, as it ſhould be unlawfull to him as a King, and unlawfull to *Vzziah* to burn incenſe, and to ſacrifice, and to doe the office of the Prieſt? If the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate doe all that the Prieſts are to doe as Prieſts, and that by a ſupream principle, and radicall power in him, he ought not to caſt off that which is proper to him as a Magiſtrate, to take that which is leſſe proper, he caſteth the care and ruling of ſouls on the Prieſts, and reſerveth the leſſer part to himſelf, to rule the bodies of men with the Sword, all theſe are ſufficiently anſwered before.

Eraſtus. *The King of Perſia*, Ezra 7. *appointed Iudges to judge the people and teach them, but there is no word of Excommunication, or any Eccleſiaſtick puniſhment, but of death, impriſonment, fines; nor did* Nehemiah *puniſh the falſe Prophets with any other puniſhment.* Ioſephus *ſpeaketh nothing of it, nor* Antiochus.

Anſ. I ſhew before that there is forfeiting, *and ſeparation from the Congregation*, Ezra 10. 8. והוא נבדל מקהל *he ſhall be ſeparated from the Church.* 2. If the King of *Perſia* appointed men to judge and teach the people, why ſhould he deny any judicature at all? 3. Where ever *Ioſephus* ſpeaketh of the judging of the Prieſts, as he doth *antiq. l.* 11. *c.* 7. *ant. l.* 11. *c.* 8. *l.* 12. *c.* 9. he hinteth at this.

Page 171. Eraſtus. *Chriſt diſchargeth his Diſciples to exerciſe dominion. Chriſt would not condemne the adulterous woman, nor judge between*

the

the brethren, Luke 12. *Paul calleth* Ministers *dispensators, stewards*, Peter *forbiddeth a dominion.*

Ans. Let *Erastus* be mindfull of this himselfe, who yet saith, that *the* Magistrate *may both judge, also (if he have time) dispence the Word and Sacraments*; if then the Magistrate by his office may preach and dispense the Sacraments, who made him a judge and a Ruler? Will this satisfie mens conscience; *The* Magistrate *as the* Magistrate *may play the* Minister; *but the* Minister *may not play the* Magistrate: Now as *Erastus* saith, the Minister in holy things, is his servant called by him; may not the Minister be called by him to the Bench also? *Erastus*; *Eli* and *Samuel*, were both Priests and Iudges, and so to *Erastus* they are not inconsistent. 2. Ministers ought not to usurpe the civill sword; *Ergo*, they have no power of governing by the sword of the Spirit, it followeth not, the contrary is evident, 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Rom.* 12. 7, 8.

Erastus. *Peter Martyr saith, Com.* 1 *Sam.* 8. *Those that live wickedly, may be corrected by the* Magistrate. *But* Papists *give one civill Ecclesiastick power to the Pope, and another to the* Magistrate, *whereas the civill* Magistrate *is sufficient enough.*

Ans. Pet. Martyr 1 *Cor.* 5. exprtly asserteth Excommunication, and acknowledgeth a Presbyterie of *Pastors* and *Seniors*, or Elders, *Peter Martyr* condemneth the use of both swords in the Pope, and saith it is sufficient that the Magistrate have the Sword. Page 173.

Erastus. *Christ saith, my Kingdom is not of this world, that is, it is not pollitick, externall, visible, for Christ reigneth in the world, but his Government is invisible, and spirituall in the Word, and the Spirit.*

Ans. Christ denieth only that his Kingdome is of this World, in regard it is not holden up by the civill sword of men, or Magistrates, as *Erastus* doth dreame, who maketh the Magistrate with his club to be the onely Catholick and principall Ruler in all Christs courts; which Christ refuteth, when he saith, *If my Kingdome were of this world, mine owne would fight for me.* Now *Erastus* will have no weapon, but the Magistrates sword to hold out, and cast out all offenders out of Christs Kingdom; but it is false, that Christs Kingdom is not politicall, externall and visible; this is to deny that Christ hath a visible Church: Sure exhorting, rebuking, censuring, withdrawing from the scandalous, excommunication, are visible externally, and in a politick spirituall way exercised

Christs Kingdome how not of this World.

ercised by Christ in his Ambassadors : for externall and spirituall are not opposed, nor are politicall and spirituall opposed, as *Erastus* dreameth, and therefore this is a *non sequitur* of *Erastus* : His Kingdom is not of this world ; *Ergo*, it is not externall.

Cap.2. l.3. 176, 177, 179.

Erastus. *When* Pompeius *invaded and possessed* Iudea, *and* Gabinius *having overcome* Alexander, *had changed the state of* Iudea, *the Pharisees did reigne wholly at Ierusalem: The Kingly power was removed and Aristocracy set up*, Ioseph. bel.Iud. l. 1. c.6. Ioseph. antiq. l. 14. c. 10. κὴ οἱ μὲν ἀπηλλαγμένοι τῆς δυναστείας ἐν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ διήγουν: *The Synedrie for the most part, had its owne authority vnder* Hyrcanus, *and under* Archilaus *it was more fully restored, as is cleer by the Evangelists and* Iosephus. Claudius *in the tenth year after Christs death, setteth forth an Edict*, Βουλομαι μηδὲν διὰ τὴν γαῖου παρ' ἀφροσύνην τῶν δικαίων τῷ Ιουδαίων ἔθνει παραπεπτωκέναι : φυλάσσεσθαι δὲ αὐτοῖς κὴ τὰ πρότερον δικαιώματα ἐμμένουσι τοις Ιουδαιων ἔθεσι; Ioseph. Ant. lib. 19. Titus Vespasianus *promised the same thing to them.*

Ans. Will then *Erastus* have Christ, *Mat.*18. to restore the power of the Sanedrim, in gaining a lost brother ; that is to cite him before the Roman Iudges : But 1. the *Romans made high Priests from* yeere to yeere, did Christ acknowledge the Sanedrim to be a restored Iudicature in this ? 2. Say that the *Sanedrim in sacris*, in in the holy things of God, had its full power, the Romans not impeding them ; hath any man a face to deny, but Pharisees corrupted both Law, Gospell, Sanedrim and all, and doth Christ establish their most corrupt government ; especially when they set themselves against the *Messiah* ? *Cesar* or *Pompeius* could give the *Sanedrim* no more then it had before they were subdued ; but before they were subdued, the *Sanedrim* was changed and corrupted. 3. This is to beg the question, to say they kept the power of the Sword : For 1. We utterly deny that by Gods Law they ever had any such power, and forsooth, because the High-Priests servant smote our Saviour on the face, and they scourged and imprisoned the Apostles ; What then ? therefore the *Sanedrim* had the Law of God for it, *and Aaron and his sonnes* might beat, scourge, imprison, and kill, as they killed *Steven*, without Law or warrant, (except the Law that they had from the Roman Emperours, for which cause I judge their *Sanedrim* was then a mixed Judicature,) surely this is a vaine consequence. 4. It is like enough

Claudius

Claudius and *Tiberius* both, gave them liberty of their own Religion, Ceremonies and customes at their pleasure, and that is much for us, the adversary so do reason from a corrupt, unjust and wicked practice to infer a Law.

Erastus. I *have solidly proved, there were not two distinct jurisdictions; but that the* Magistrate *Governed all. I deny not that the* Magistrate *took counsell at those that were skilled in the Law. And I have proved that the Sanedrim in Christs time, when he spake these words, had the power of the sword, in things pertaining to Religion.* Pag. 179.

Ans. Let another man praise thee, solidity of the probation to most of Protestant Divines, is plain emptinesse. 2. That the *Magistrate* took advice of Divines and learned men skilled in the Law, is not like the first pattern of *Moses*, *David*, *Solomon*, who as *Magistrates* (saith *Erastus*) *did rule all in the Church, gave the Law to* Aaron *his sons*, directed and commanded the Prophets from the Lord, as neerest to him, what they should do, what Laws they should teach the people: Shew us one precept, practise, or promise in the word, where *Moses*, *David*, *Solomon* asked Counsell at *Aaron*, the Priests, *Gad*, *Nathan*, or the Prophets; saying, *O sons of Aaron, O Prophets advise us Magistrates, what Laws we should command you, touching your office, your holy garments, your washing, your beasts clean and unclean, your leper, your putting men out of the Camp, touching the forme, dimensions, structure, materials of the Arke, Tabernacle, Temple, &c. that we may know what to command you from the* Lord; *for we are nearer to the* Lord, *and have a more eminent place, as Church-Officers, then you who are but our Vicars, Deputies, and servants to be directed by us.*

Moses, David, Solomon, appointed to the Priests nothing in Gods worship as Kings.

Now 1. *Moses* received all Laws immediatly from God, and never consulted with any man, either *Aaron*, Priest, or Prophet; *David* and *Solomon* had the forme of the Temple, given to them by the Lord in writing, and advised with none at all; & therefore received from God, and delivered to the Church, what they received of the Lord.

2. What warrant the Magistrates should advise with Ministers; what they should command Ministers, to preach and do in their Ministery, if by vertue of their Office they command Ministers.

3. So like as Christ referreth men to the Civill sword on their bodies to gain their souls, which is the scope of Christ, *Matth.* 18.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII. Queſt. 13.

Whether Eraſtus *can make good that the Synedry was the Civill Magiſtrate?*

Eraſtus l. 4. cap. 4. pag. 275, 276.

ERaſtus. *When the Prieſt accuſed Jeremiah,* Chap. 26. *of blaſphemy, he ſate not amongſt the Judges, but ſtood as an accuſer before the* Magiſtrate : So *Beza. Eraſtus* replieth, *Your Synedry had no Civill juriſdiction, becauſe it is a dream* : 2. *Should* Paſhur *the Prieſt be both accuſer and judge?* 3. *In* Ieremiahs *time, there was a* Monarch, *in whoſe hand was all power; in Chriſts time there was an Ariſtocracy, the Government being in the hands of ſome choſen men.*

De Presb. p. 106.

Anſ. Certainly, *Ier.* 26. 10. the Princes ſate down in judgement, but that the Prieſts ſate with them, we have not one word, only the Prieſts accuſed him as worthy to die in the queſtion of Law, and ſo the people, *ver.* 8. Now the people undeniably cannot have been Iudges. 2. Nor do we ſay, the *Prieſts were both judges* Civill to condemn *Ieremiah* to die, and accuſers: that doth not hinder, but they in an Eccleſiaſticall way were Iudges, touching the queſtion of Law, whether he had ſpoken blaſphemy or not, and alſo Accuſers before the Civill Iudges. 3. It is to beg the queſtion to ſay, that all power even of Church-cenſuring was in the hand of the King. 1. The King might exclude none of the Lepers out of the Camp, the Prieſts only could by the Law of God do this, and excluded *Uzziah* the King, as a Leper out of the Congregation: The King could not judge who were clean, who unclean. 2. That all power was in the hand of the Kings, as if the Kings of *Iudah* were by Gods Law abſolute, can never be proved, but the contrary is evident, *Deut.* 17. And that inferiour Iudges were eſſentially Iudges, and the Lords immediate Deputies, is clear by Scripture, *Deut.* 1. 16. 2 *Chron.* 19. 5, 6, 7. *Exod.* 18. 21, *&c. Numb.* 11. 16, 17, 18. *Pſal.* 82. 6, 7. *Rom.* 13. 1, 2.

The Prieſts in matters of death, judged only *De queſtione iuris*, of the queſtion of Law.

Pag. 276, 277.

Eraſtus. *You aſk how* Caiaphas, *and the Prieſts had power againſt Ieſus;*

Iesus: *I answer:* 1. *From God:* 2. *From the Kings of Persia.* 3. *From the permission of the* Romans: *They apprehended him, and bound him, which was a part of Civill power, nor was this some of the confusion under the Maccabees: How can this be proved? Christ never rebuked it, nor his Apostles; the contrary is clear in Iosephus.*

Ans. A permissive power from God, can prove no Law-power. 2. *Persians* and *Romans* could not give to *Priests* and *Levites* the power of the sword, to do what the Law of God had exempted them from doing, they were not so much as numbred for the war, but set apart for the service of Gods house, *Num.* 1. 3. 45, *&c.* they might in some extraordinary cases judge in civill business with the Civill Iudges in the same Iudicature, but this was no standing Law. 2. *Erastus* seeketh we would prove that the practise of bloody *Pharisees* was not against Law: He knoweth, it is his own Argument, *Affirmanti incumbit Probatio.* 3. *Christ* and the *Apostles* rebuked not particularly many other sins. *Pilate* might have accused them for binding one of *Cesars* Subjects, of whom he had said, *he found no fault in him.* 4. That *Ioseph* was a *Priest*, or a *Levite*, I reade not, he was an *Honourable Councellor*, some think *of Pilates Councell.* 5. That they had any Law of God to apprehend *Iesus*, or that *Ioseph* had any hand in either condemning, or doing any thing in the *Sanedrim*, but shewing his judgement, as a Iudge in the question of Law, what was blasphemy, we must deny, let *Erastus* prove it, if so be *Erastus* make him either *Priest* or *Levite*? *Iob.* 18. 31. The Iews expressly deny the power that *Erastus* giveth them: *Pilate therefore said unto them, take him and judge him according to your* Law, which was a salt mocking of them. *I know, if you had power, you should not have brought him to me; therefore if ye have power, use it: The Iews therefore said unto him, It is not lawfull for us to put any man to death,* and the Evangelist addeth, ver. 32. *That the saying of Iesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die,* that is, God had taken power of life and death from the Iews, in his admirable providence, that Iesus might die a *Roman death*, due for treason, that is, that he might be crucified; *Ergo*, the Iews had no power to put him to death. It is weak and empty that *Erastus* saith, *They had not power to put him to death, for saying he was King, because that*

was a civill crime: But they had power to put him to death, and to stone him for blasphemy; for the Iews say universally without distinction of causes, with two negations, which in the Greek Language is a strong and universall negation, ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα, *We have not power to kill any man, Ergo*, the place will never prove that the Church men might not kill him, because the Iews might kill no man: you will say, *How had they power with swords and staves to take the Kings free subject and binde him, which yet they did?* I answer, it was an usurped power, for by *Erastus* his doctrine, they had no more power to take him and binde him for Treason, which was a civill crime, then they had to kill him for Treason, both was alike unlawfull by the *Roman* Law, and *Pilate* being a man willing to please the people, as the event of the businesse sheweth, did not in a legall way challenge them for binding him; but he durst not be answerable to his Prince *Cesar*, if he had past by such a high point, as their putting Christ to death: But we desire any Law of God (for practises especially of wicked men are no binding rule) that *Priests or Levites*, in the Old-Testament, might either binde a Iew or put him to death, and when *Pilate* did stand so much to put Christ to death, they would have used their own power, malice so necessitating them, if they had had any, and might well have said to *Pilate*, *It is lawfull for us to put him to death for blasphemy, but we will not use our power, we so love to be loyall to Cæsar*; but they say the contrary, *We have no power to put any man to death.* They say indeed, *that by their law he ought to die.* But that they had no power to put him to death, for the Common people said, that, as may appear, if we compare, *Ioh.19. ver.5.* with *ver.12.* with *Matth.27.25.* and with *Act.2.36. Act.3.12. &c.* and yet *Erastus* will not say that the common people were Members of the *Sanedrim*, or had power of life and death, as the Civill *Magistrate* had.

The Priests and Levites had no Law-power by God's Law or from Cesar, to put Christ to death.

Erastus. Steven *was stoned by the Sanedrim, not by tumult, for there were witnesses, as the law required*, Act.7. *The witnesses (who by the law were to cast the first stone at the man condemned) were here, therefore there was Law-power to stone him, though they did it unjustly.*

pag.279.

Ans. Beza meant, that *Steven* was stoned by tumult, that is, without any Law-power, except usurped, when the Iews were

now

now riper for destruction, and had taken on them the blood of the Lord of glory, and so growing more daring and insolent against the *Roman power*, to their own just desolation, that came on them under *Vespasian*. That they used witnesses, will not prove they had Law to stone *Steven*, for *Timothy* had no power of life and death over Elders, one brother hath no power of life and death over another, as *Erastus* will grant, yet with both there is use of witnesses, 1 *Tim.*5.19. *Matth.*18.16. This I hope concludeth but weakly, any lawfull civill power, so all this is from a naked practise of those *that alwayes resisted the holy Ghost*: And the like I say of *Paul*, who saith *Act.*26.10. of himself, *Many of the Saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the high Priests*, τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών; suppose it were true that *Saul* had Law and Authority from the high Priests to imprison the Saints, and to murther the Saints, no *high Priest* can make over a Law-power to another, which he hath not himself; now certain this Law-power of the *Pharisees* and *High Priests* by Gods Law, is the question. Let us see Law or institution, where the High Priests (for of these only the Text speaketh) did imprison and put to death, either blasphemer or false Prophet, or, if by *Moses* his Law, which must be a rule to all the *High Priests* in the time of persecuting *Saul*, it was either Law or practise, that the High Priest had power to imprison, or scourge, or put to death any man, and this was most proper to the King, and the Civill judge, and the Elders and Iudges in every City, 2 *Sam.*1.14.15,16. 1 *Kin.*2.9. & 2.6,7.*Isa.* 1.23. *Ier.* 22.1, &c. *Ier.*22.27. *Numb.*35.12.24. *Deut.*22.18. & 7.5. & 19.12.13. *ver.*18,19,20,21. & 21.19. 1 *Kin.*21.11. *Hos.* 6.8. *Zeph.*3.1,2,3. *Rom.*13.4. We know undoubtedly the King, the Civill Iudge, had power of all bodily punishments, as of scourging, death, stoning, strangling, crucifying, hanging; But shew me any *Vestigium*, or the least consequence where the Priests or High Priests had such power, or did execute such power in any one man: it is true, *Deut.*17. the Priests might determine in Law what was blasphemy, and so what deserved the punishment of blasphemy, which is death: But so the written Law of God, the very letter of it could in many cases clearly resolve the Civill judge, even though there had been no controversie about the fact, whether it was condemned in the Law of God, or not: we know *Samuel* not

The Sanedrim had no Law-power against Steven.

The like is true of Paul.

being judge, but *Saul* being *King* & *supream Magistrate*, & not executing judgement on the Amalekites, he killed *Agag*, certainly, all Divines, even Popish not excepted, say, *Saul* the Civil Magistrate ought to have killed *Agag*, & that *Samuel* not by vertue of his place, as a prophet, or as a Priest or a Member of the *Sanedrim* (as *Erastus* would say) but excited by an extraordinary motion of Gods spirit, killed him, as *Phineas the son of Aaron slew*, Num. 25. *Zimri and Cosbi*, 7, 8. And *Elijah* slew *Baals Priests*, 1 *Kin.* 18. 40. 2 *Kin.* 1. 10. If *Phineas* by office, and *Elias* by office killed those ill doers, as *Erastus* would dream, The Prophets and Priests by their office were Civill Iudges, and had power to put to death evil doers. Now *Erastus* denyeth, and with good reason, that the Lords disciples *should bear civill dominion over men, as the Lords of the Gentiles*, *Luk.* 22. 24, 25, 26. and that Christ though both a Prophet and a Priest could not take on him, to *be a Iudge and a Ruler*, Luk. 12. yet here *Erastus* will have the *High Priest*, by a Law-power, to imprison and put to death. 2. *Erastus* may with as good reason say, that the high Priests had a Law-power by Gods institution to punish and to compell Christians to blaspheme God, and to persecute them to strange Cities, and to murther the Saints that believed in the Lord Iesus; for he went to *Damascus* for this effect, *Act.* 26. 12. *μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων*, *With power and Commission from the chief Priests*, This was not a Law-power in generall, to punish such as the Law of *Moses discerned* to be blasphemers, but a limited particular Commission to murther the Saints, who should hear and obey the Prophet, *like unto Moses*, *whom the Lord should raise up*, Deut. 18. What Law had the High Priests for this? Had they not a Law on the contrary? *Deut.* 18.

Pag. 280. Erastus. *Paul confesseth ingenuously, before the Roman Iudges, that he persecuted the Saints, and that he had authority and power from the Priests and Elders so to do*, Act. 22. & 26. *and we read not that the Priests or Paul were censured for these things, as having done any thing against the Laws or will of the Romans*, Act. 5. *They send their Officer, the Captain of the Temple, they imprison the Apostles, they convene a Councell, give out a sentence, and agitate the killing*

ling of the Apostles amongst them, while Gamaliel *impede them.*

Ans. It is true, the *Romans* heard that the *Sanedrim* exercised Civill jurisdiction, and inflicted bodily punishment. But for false Doctrine, the *Romans* I conceive took as little care as *Gallio* did of any of Gods matters, and whether the *Sanedrim* kept the rule of the Lords first institution, *Deut.* 17. yea, they looked not much whether the Priests might put to death false Prophets, or if the Civill judges only might do it; and *Erastus* said before, that the *Romans* gave the Iews liberty of all their own laws and customes in matters of Religion. 2. What care would the *Romans* take, whether the Iews killed and oppressed Iews, for questions of their owne Religion, so they remained loyall and true to *Cesar*? 3. We know *Herod*, *Felix*, *Festus*, *Agrippa*, being willing to pleasure the Iews, did oversee many breaches of Law in them, especially in matters of the Gospel, *Act.* 12. 3. *and* 24. 27. *and* 16.36,37,38,39 40. *Ioh.*19.15 16,17. 4. How doth he prove that the *Romans* did not take this for a breach of their Lawes? Because they accuse not the *Sanedrim* for this? surely it followeth not: We read not that the *Romans* challenged them for a manifest breach of Law, when they scourged and cast in prison *Paul* and *Silas*, who were *Romans* and had not condemned them, *Act.*16.38,39. 5. We deny not a lawfull judicature of the *Sanedrim*, *Act.*5. But that they had any Law of God, to scourge, and imprison, and put to death the Apostles, is the question; we say, they neither had Gods law, nor durst be answerable to the *Romans* Laws, for that fact, and so this is a fact brought to prove a Law.

Erastus. *If this was insolencie in the Jevvs which rose from the confusion of the two jurisdictions; hovv say some of yours, none can be excommunicated without the consent of the Magistrate? Where did Christ divide the externall Government of the Church in Civill Government and Ecclesiasticall, as you distinguish them?* Pag. 280. 281.

Ans. 1. That it is expedient, that the *Christian Magistrate* should be acquainted with the Excommunication of any under his jurisdiction, that he may satisfie his own Conscience in punishing him civilly, it is like some of our Divines do teach: But that the Magistrate have a negative voice in Excommunication, none of ours teach. 2. We make no such division as that of the Civill and the Ecclesiasticall Government of the Church. *Erastus* may dream of such

How the Christian Magistrate is to be acquainted with excommunication.

such a distinction: We know, all Government of the Church, as the Church, to us is Ecclesiasticall: There is a Government of men of the Church that is Civill; but we dreamed never of a Civill Government of the Church: All the Government of the Church, as the Church, though externall, is Spirituall, Heavenly, and subordinate to *Jesus Christ* as *Lord and King* of his own house, as the Government of a house, a Kingdom, an Army, a City is subordinate to the Lord of the house, to the King, Generall Commander, and Lord Mayor, and it is no more a Civill Government subordinate to the Magistrate and his Sword, then Christs Kingdom visible and externall, or invisible and internall is of this world.

When therefore *Erastus* denyeth that there is any Church-Government, he meaneth there is no Spirituall Church Government in the hands of Presbyters; but becaus we know no Government of the Church as the Church, but it is Spirituall, and the Government of the Church by the Christian Magistrate, is a Civill Government of men as men, and that by the power of the Sword, and so it is no Church-Government at all; and therefore we justly say, that *Erastus* denyeth all Church-Government.

Page 281. Erastus. *When* Paul *saith*, Act. 23. *Thou sittest to judge me according to the Law, Doth he not acknowledge the High Priest to be his Judge?* Paul *denieth that he had done any thing contrary to the Law: And* Tertullus *saith, We would have judged him according to our* Law, *if* Lysias *had not without* Law *violently taken him from us.*

Ans. Ananias was to judge him only in an Ecclesiasticall way; and when *Paul* saw that they went beyond their line, to take his life, he appealed from their inferior judicature to *Cæsar*, who only had power of his life. 2. *Lysias* had Law to vindicate an innocent man accused on his life, before a most uncompetent judicature. *Tertullus* knew the Iews had favour and connivence in many Lawlesse Facts.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII. Quest. 14.

Whether Erastus *do strongly confute the Presbytery of the New Testament.*

BEza *saith, there was need of some select men in the Apostles time to lay hands on* Ministers, *to appoint Deacons, for there was no Jewish Synedrie, no Magistrate to do it; and when* Paul *forbiddeth Christians for things of this life to implead other before the heathen Magistrate, would he send them in spirituall businesse to such? or must that, Tell the Church, have no use for a hundreth years after Christ?* So *Beza*; yea if the Lord ascending to heaven left Officers for the building and Governing his Church, *Eph.* 4. 11. and some to be over the people in the Lord, 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. 13. some to watch for their souls, whom they were to obey, some to feed the flock, and to drive away the wolves, *Act.* 20. 28, 29, 30. some to Govern the house of God, no lesse then their owne house, 1. *Tim.* 3. 4. a Presbytery in generall *Erastus* cannot deny, only he denieth such a Presbytery, and saith, that it is like this, such a one is a living creature; *Ergo*, such an one is a dog. But if I can demonstrate, there is a Presbytery and they were not all Bishops, as is clear, *Rom.* 12. 8. 9. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. and if, Tell the Church, by no Grammer, can be, Tell the Bishop, except you make the Queen the Bride, and the servant or friend of the Bridegroome all one; It must follow there is both a Presbytery, and such a Presbytery in the Church, nor do we argue from a generall to specials.

Erastus l. 4. c. 5. c. 6. Beza de presbyter. p. 110.

A colledge of church-rulers in the N. T.

pa. 284.

Erastus. *The Church may not kill men, but she may pray that God would destroy them, or convert her enemies.* Page 285.

Ans. To pray that God would destroy him, whom we are to admonish as a brother, is a strange discipline; *Erastus* will never make good from Scripture, that God hath appointed praying for the destruction of men to be a saving ordinance, appointed of Christ for gaining of souls, (such as we take rebuking, admonishing, excommunication, eschewing the company of scandalous brethren, which have for their intrinsecall end, the repentance of a brother under

under these censures) and therefore this of *Erastus* his killing of men, is a new forged censure.

Pag.286. Erastus. *Whereever the Scripture speaketh in the New Testament of a Presbytery, there is no other understood, but that of preachers; therefore it is false, that the Apostles have commanded any other Elders beside those that labour in the Word.*

Ans. The antecedent is false; 1 *Tim.* 5.17. as I have demonstrate in another place, I repeat it not here, let any disciple of *Erastus* answer if he can. 2. The consequence is vaine, for if in every place of the *New Testament*, where mention is made of an Elder, the *Holy Ghost* mean only a Preaching Elder, it followeth only that any other officers, as Deacons, and *those that labour not in the Word*, & yet Govern well, are not called with the name of Presbyters: And so the Argument is against the name, not against the office and thing. What if the Presbytery be named from the most principall part, as is ordinary in Scripture, doth it follow that there be none members of the Presbytery, but only Preachers of the Word? In no sort. *Paul* saith of the visible Church of *Corinth*, *Ye are bought with a price, ye are justified, ye are sanctified*; Ergo, none were members of the visible Church, but those that are redeemed, justified, and sanctified, it is like the consequence of *Erastus*. 3. I retort this vaine argument thus; none in Scripture have the name of Apostles, But the Eleven, and *Mathias*, none are called the witnesses of the Lord but they, 1 Ioh.1.1,2. *Ergo*, there be no preaching Ministers, neither *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Epaphroditus* that are to be called witnesses of the Lord, but the twelve Apostles; so where doth *Erastus* finde that διακονία a deaconrie or office of labour in the Ministery is given to any, but to those that labour in the word? *Rom.*11.13. *Ergo*, must there be no deaconry, but labouring in the word, the plaine contrary is *Act.6.*

pa.287. Erastus. *Beside Levites and Priests, there belonged to the Synedry of the Iews other heads of families*; Ergo, *beside Ministers there must be Prophets and Doctors in the Presbytery, it followeth not.*

Beza de presbyt. p.112.113. *Ans. Erastus* fancies a conclusion of an Argument that *Beza* saith not; for he saith; *Ergo*, beside Ministers there must be some chiefe men, which we call ruling Elders, to represent the people, that

that there may be(as all our Divines and Scripture teach)a threefold government in the Church : A Monarchy, in regard of Iesus Christ the onely head and King of the Church, as the Iewish Church had their High Priest a Type of him; and *Aristocracy*, in Pastors and Teachers, as the Iewes had their *Priests* and *Levites*; and a *Democracy* in the ruling Elders, as the Iewes had their *Zekenim*, and their *Heads of families* and *Elders* in the Ecclesiasticall Sanedrim, and we in the Presbytery to represent the people: and of these three the Iewish Ecclesiastick Sanedrim is made up 2 *Chron.* 19. 8. of the Levites and the priests ומראשי האבות *of the heads of Fathers*, or Masters of families. Now *Erastus* yeeldeth that good *Iehoshaphat* departed not from Gods institution in his reformation, all this *Erastus* passeth over in silence, being ignorant of the Iewish Church government, and not able to answer, and he addeth something of Doctors not to a purpose, and saith there be no Doctors but Pastors onely in the Word ; contrary to *Rom.* 12, 7, 8. *Ephes.* 4. 11. where they are clearly distinguished.

Erastus. *Some chosen men must be in the Presbytery to represent the people*; Ergo, *these must be Doctors and Prophets, but there is no need of that, for Bishops of old represented the whole Church.* Page 288.

Ans. Beza hath not any such argument, he contendeth for Ruling *Elders*, not for Prophets and Doctors to represent the people. 2. Where doth the Scripture speake of such an office as a Bishop having Majority of power above *Presbyters* ? (for since *Erastus* denieth all Ecclesiasticall Government in Teachers, he must deny all Majority of Ecclesiasticall Governement also, he that denieth the positive, denieth also the comparative degree) now this is a Bishop that neither Scripture, nay nor popish Antiquity dreamed of. 3. In what is a Bishop the representative Church ? The like is *Erastus* his third Argument. Beza de Presbyt. p. 112. 113.

Erastus. 1 Cor. 12. *How is Government a Presbytery? how are Overseers & governments, Doctors & Prophets ? There be many kinds of Governours. I wonder that by δυναμεις Miracles, you understand not the power of Excommunication, that hath terrified all the World; how are Doctors & Prophets added to Pastors, are they not teachers as well as Pastors, but that they administer not the Sacraments? & how doe you* Page 289.

prove that? how prove you Overseers to be other then Ministers?

Ans. Governements to us are but a part of the Presbyterie. 2. There be many kinds of Governours, but he durst not venture to shew what is signified by governments, lest he should say, his Magistrate must be the onely *Church Governour*, but he knoweth that a Magistrate as a Magistrate is no member nor part of the Church, but as he is a Christian; for then *Cesar*, *Herod*, *Pontius Pilate*, as Magistrates must be set in the body of Christ, as Apostles, and Teachers and Prophets, which all the World will cry shame on. 3. *Beza* said never that Teachers and prophets are cast to Ministers to make a Presbyterie, for by Teachers he meaneth Pastors. 4. Because *Paul* setteth downe Governments different from Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, they must be some Officers different from them, we can finde none else, but such as rule well, *and yet labour not in the Word*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. let *Erastus* shew us what they are, he dares not open his minde: for he meaneth a Justice of Peace, or a King, or a heathen judge must be in the wombe of this, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. let himselfe be mid-wife.

page 290. 291. *Erastus* answering to 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. saith κοπιᾶν *to labour is to labour diligently, the meaning is like this*; I *wish well to all Pastors, but especially to those who with great industrie, fidelity and paines feed the flocke committed to them, as* I *love all inclined to studie, but especially such as watch night and day upon studies, for some are more diligent in teaching then others, heres no Tautologie to say,* I *love all that sincerely and soundly teach the Word, especially those that diligently teach it.*

Due right of Presbyteries, qu. 7. c. 7. sect. 7. page 141, 142, 143. seq. *Ans.* I cannot particularly discusse this place, I have done it elsewhere fully μαλιστα δε with two Articles noteth two species of Elders, as *Tit.* 1. 11. 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. *Gal.* 6. 10. *Phil.* 4. 22. 2. This is a Tautologie, I love all well governing and faithfull Elders, especially those that labour in the word; they may be well and painful feeding Pastors, who are not painfull in preaching the Word, and this is Tautologie; I love all that are studious, and studie excellently, and especially those that studie night and day, as *Erastus* must say if he make the phrase agree to the purpose, to feed καλῶς well in a feeding Pastor includeth labouring in the Word, since *Erastus* expoundeth the place, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. of Church officers, he cannot deny but the place holdeth forth a Government, and a ὑποτυπωσις of Church Officers,

Officers, for beside labouring in the Word and doctrine, which is preaching, here is *well governing*, it is a shame then to *Erastus* to expound this place so, and yet deny all *Church Government*, except in the hands of the Magistrate.

Erastus. *Ancient and moderne Doctors deny two sorts of Elders.*

Ans. I have made the contrary appear in the place cited; I will not weary the Reader with reasons set downe at full in another place.

Erastus. *Shew where the Church hath a judicature, to punish sins different from the Magistrates judicature, as the* Lord *made a power of burning incense to the* Lord, *to be different from the Kings royall power.*

Ans. Mat. 18. Mat. 16. Ioh. 20. Mat. 28. 19, 20. Eph. 20. 28. 1 Cor. 5. 1, 2, &c. Rev. 2. 1, 2. and 20. 21. *Ministers* are no lesse separated under the New Testament to all ministeriall acts of feeding, by the word and rod of Discipline, then Priests were of Old.

Erastus. Nathan *did not Excommunicate* David. page 293.

Ans. Nathan had assurance from God that his sin was pardoned; 2. That the *Sanedrim* did not cast *David* out is a fact, and proveth not they had no power; for 80. Priests cast *Vzziah* out of the house of God for a lesse fault, that carried in its face lesse scandall.

Erastus. *The Prophets never accuse the* Priests, *that they admitted the unclean to the sacrifices and holy things of God.*

Ans. The contrary is evident, *Ier.* 5. 31. *Ezek.* 22. 25, 26. and 44. 8, 9, 10. contrary to their Office, *Deut.* 17. 11, 12. *Levit.* 10. 10.

Erastus. *David* Psal. 51. *sheweth he would have given Sacrifices, but God craved a broken heart*; Ergo, *he had power to sacrifice.* page 294.

Ans. Not except withall he had offered a contrite heart to God.

Paul (saith Erastus) *speaketh of coming to them with the rod, of delivering to Satan, of his comming with the authority God had given him, of his coming to them mourning.* Erastus l. 4. c. 7. p. 295. 296.

Ans. Where saith *Paul* that he his alone did use the rod? doth he not ascribe judging and casting out to the *Corinthians*? 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. &c. and forgiving of the incestuous man 2 *Cor.* 2. to them *Beza* saith, *this power is necessary to purge the Church, lest it be infected; even to the end of the world, and therfore must be left with the Church.* page 296.

Erastus. *To be gathered in the Name of the Lord is not referred*

ferred to the congregations meeting together, but to Pauls *act of delivering to Satan, the Corinthians and* Pauls *Spirit instructed thus with the power of Christ, might have delivered others to Satan as they did this man, if the Apostle had not pardoned them, but they had not* Pauls *spirit with them in their convention afterward, because in no place he biddeth them be gathered together with his Spirit, as he doth here.*

Ans. Paul doth construe the words *v.* 4. *in the Name of Christ* with the Participle *συναχθέντων ye being conveened,* and the words ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, are separated from the word κέκρικα *(I have judged)* by the interposition of these words, ὡς παρὼν τὸ ὕτω τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον so *Erastus* his grammar will be a little confused. 2. What needed the *Corinthians* be *gathered together with the Spirit of* Paul, *and the power of the Lord Jesus* to pray that the man might be miraculously killed? for when they were not gathered together in a Church meeting, but were all *separatim* in their own houses and closets, they had power to judge the man, that is, to pray that he might be miraculously killed, else *Erastus* cannot make Paul, in any reasonable manner to rebuke them because they prayed not that he might be killed, for *Erastus* must suppose the power of praying; for this, in faith, was tyed to this publike convention of the Church, and *Erastus* saith, *in no place he biddeth them be gathered together as here.* This *Spirit of* Paul *and power of the Lord Jesus* that was in them, was not given to elevate them to any higher or more supernaturall acts of miraculous co-operating with Paul, then their naked act of consenting that the man should be cut off, and this act of consenting, they could not want, in their private praying at home, that the man be miraculously killed, and so this spirit of *Paul*, and the power of the Lord Iesus shall be brought so low, as I know not what to make of it.

No miraculous killing 1 Cor. 5. or tormenting of the mans body.

Erastus. *If they had prayed that God would punish this enormous sinne, whether God had heard them or not, they had discharged their dutie.* Page 296.

Ans. But it is evident he rebuketh them not onely, for not mourning for the mans fall, and not praying that he might be punished; but for that they conveened not, and did not judge, and put away the

the man; *Ergo*, they had alwayes an ordinary power to judge and cast out scandalous persons, and *Paul* rebuketh them for not improving this power; then it was not any miraculous power not ordinarily in their hand, as powers of that kinde are supposed to be.

Erastus *saith*, διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς *is to be construed with* σημειοῦσθε; *as the meaning may be*; *note such a one in an Epistle, and write to me, that I may censure him.* pa. 297.

Ans. This is throwne Grammar, which the Greek doth not bear without violence, for *Paul* saith, *If he obey not our doctrine, written by Epistle*, marke such a one, and he commandeth them to inflict a censure on him, by eschewing his company.

CHAP. XIX. Quest. 15.

Of the use of Excommunication toward the Magistrate especially. Lib. 5. c. 1. Erast. 298.

ERastus. *How many thousands of men have been killed by occasion of Excommunication in* Germany? *it hath subjected Kings and Scriptures, and all to the Pope.*

Ans. All this may be said of the Gospell and of Christ, that *hee is appointed for the fall and ruine of many*, and that *he came not to give Peace, but the Sword*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 8. *Luke* 2. 34. *Mat.* 10. 34, 35. But the cause is not in the Gospell, or in Christ, but in mens corrupt nature: Excommunication is the Rod of the *King out of Zion*, and we know how impatient men are of the *yoke of Christ*; Excommunication abused by the Pope doth all this.

Erastus. *Excommunication cureth not wounded consciences, but begetteth Hypocrites.* page 299.

Ans. So publike rebuking of those that sin publikely, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. being abused doth beget *Hypocrites*, *Esa.* 57. 1, 2, 3. *Ezek.* 31, 32, 33. 1 *King.* 21. 27, 28, 29. so doth the Rod, the Word, the giving of almes, praying, being abused to wicked ends, *make hypocrites*, *Mat.* 23. 14, 25. *Mat.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4. *Psal.* 78. *v.* 34, 35, 36. *Hos.* 7. 14. Excommunication is innocent of all these.

Erastus. *I thinke it not amisse that the Magistrate chuse godly and prudent* page 299.

prudent men, and joyne to them godly Ministers, who in place of the Magistrate may inquire in the life and manners of men, and convene before them loose livers, and rebuke them, and if need be, deferre them to the Magistrate; But this is unjust, that such a Senate be chosen by the Church, which hath no power to chuse them. 2. That they are not chosen in the Name of the Magistrate, but against his will. 3. That they subject the Magistrate to them.

Erastus yieldeth there is a Presbytery.

Ans. Erastus is willing there be a Presbytery: 1. Of mixed men, prudent men, and godly Pastors. 2. Chosen by the *Magistrate*. 3. That they judge and rebuke Murtherers, Extortioners, Oppressors, Thieves, &c. But 1. he should give us Scripture for this his new Presbytery. He condemneth ours, because it wanteth (as he saith) the Authority; and the like of his Presbytery in the Old or New Testament you finde not. 2. That Ministers should judge of bloods, thefts, treasons, paricides (for all these are loose livers) and of goods and inheritances, and give an account to the Civill Magistrate, is all one as if the Ministers of the Gospel should *be Iudges as the Lords of the Gentiles*, such as *Pilate, Fœlix* and the rest, so they do it at the Command of the Supream Magistrate; then the King may warrant Ministers to go against the Command and practise of Christ, *Luk.* 22. 24, 25, 26. and 12, 13, *&c.* 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. For this is a Civill Judicature. 3. Then the Ministers rebuking in the name of the Civill Magistrate, may make him to Preach & exhort in the name of the Civil Magistrate. So Ministers, are they to hear the word at the Magistrates mouth? I thought Ministers had been the Ambassadors of an higher King, *Ezech.* 2. 7, 8. and 3. 3. *Speak my words to them, Rom.* 1. 1. 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. 4. If the Ministers rebuke as Ambassadors of Christ: Those to whom they Preach the word of reconciliation, those they are to rebuke with Authority, and all hearers are subject to them: Magistrates or others, high or low: This is clear by 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. 20, &c. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. For rebuking in way of Preaching, or in way of censure, is a part of the Gospel. But Pastors are to Preach the Gospel to all, to great and small who stand in need of Reconciliation, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20, *Act.* 9. 15. *He is a chosen vessel to me, to bear my name before Gentiles and Kings, and the Children of Israel.*

The Magistrate under Church discipline.

Erastus. *It is false that the Sword of the Magistrate is not suf-*

ſufficient to coerce ſins, Pſal. 101. *Kings have put to death thoſe that ſeek not God: It is nothing that you ſay, the Prieſt judged thoſe ſame ſins in a ſpirituall manner, that the Magiſtrate judged politically; for it is falſe, that the Prieſts judged in a Judicature ſeparated from the Civill Judges, as your Presbytery ſitteth. See* Levit. cap. 4. 5. 6. *God ſeemeth to have given no Laws of puniſhing offenders by themſelves, as with us, leaſt we ſhould imagine two diſtinct Judicatures.*

Anſ. We deny not, but the Sword is ſufficient to puniſh offenders, in its own kinde, in order to the peace of the Common-wealth. to remove evil; to cauſe others fear, to pacifie Gods wrath, as the Scriptures ſpeak: ſo *David* and good Kings *purged the city of God,* but *Eraſtus* cannot deny but God ordained ſpirituall means of rebukings, putting out of the Camp, eſchewing the company of offenders, that they may be aſhamed, and thoſe ſpirituall means have a ſpirituall influence on the ſoul to remove offences, to gain the offenders, *Matth.* 18.15. *Pſal.* 110.2. *Iſa.* 11.4. *Pſal.* 141.5. 2 *Theſſ.* 3.14,15.

2. The word maketh the Prieſts ſeparated from Civill Iudges, *Zach.* 3.7. *The Angel of the Lord proteſted unto* Ioſhua *the high Prieſt, if thou wilt walk in my wayes, and keep my charge, then thou ſhalt alſo judge my houſe, and thou ſhalt keep my courts.* The *Civill Magiſtrate* judged not the houſe of God, the way that the High Prieſt did. The Divines that noteth on the place, ſay, *The chief part in Eccleſiaſticall affairs was upon the High Prieſt,* Deut. 17. 12. 2 *Chron.* 19.11. The word דין that is given to the Prieſt is to judge, to give out ſentence in judgement, the very word that is given to King *Ioſiah, He judged the cauſe of the poor and needy,* and *Ier.* 5.28. *They judge not the cauſe, the cauſe of the fatherleſſe,* and Ier. 21.12. *O houſe of* David *execute judgement in the morning,* and *the ſons of* Aaron *the Prieſts,* 1 *Chron.* 24.5. are made ſome of them *Governors of the ſanctuary, and Governors of the houſe of God*: It is the word that ſignifies Princes, 2 *Kin.* 9.5. *A Word to thee O Prince* השר, 1 *Sam.* 22.2. 1 *Chro.* 11.6. *Ier.* 17.25, *Num.* 23.3.10. *All the princes of Moab,* Iſa. 30.4. Iſa. 10.8. *Are not my princes Kings?* and *Lev.* 4.5,6. chapters, judiciall acts are given to the Prieſt

Annot. on the Bible, An. 1645. in Zach. 3.7.

A judicature proper to the priests as priests.

Priest that are proper to him as Priest, which none do but he, nor have the Civill Iudges any part in it, more then they can offer sacrifices which none do but the priests, for he was to judge of the quality of the sins, and might not offer any sacrifice for every sin, nor *dip his finger in the blood of the bullock seven times*, for every sin, this spirituall judicature was the Priests. And neither *Moses* the Prince nor any Civill Iudge on earth could share with the Priests in judging this: all the world will say the judge may use the sword against the Murtherer, and Elders or Pastors have not to do with the sword at all: and the Pastors are to convince, rebuke and work upon the conscience of the Murtherer to gain him to repentance, and no civill judge as a civill judge hath to share with him in this: here be distinct punishments, one corporall and civill, another spirituall, why then must they not flow from two distinct Iurisdictions? or if it displease any man, that we call Church-censures with the name of punishment, we can forbear the name, *for rebukes, suspension from the Sacraments, Excommunication*, because they are intrinsecally, and of their own nature such as tend not to the hurt, but to the gaining and saving of the souls of the persons censured; they are unproperly punishments, as the power and court they come from is unproperly a rod a Iudicature, a Court, and those that inflict the censures improperly Iudges, yet can it not be denied to be spirituall Government, and that there is a spirituall sword, the word of God, and a spirituall coaction, flowing from Heralds, or servants in the name of the King of Kings and Head of the Church, who reigneth in his own Ordinances, and Ministers.

Page 300.

Erastus. *The priests bade* Uzziah *not burn incense, because it was their part only to sacrifice: But where is it written that the King was condemned by the sentence of the Priests?*

Ans. The Priests were a Colledge of Elders, who not only judicially condemned the Kings fact as against the *Law of God*, but 2 Chron.26. *Azariah and eighty priests with him withstood him*, and resisted him, yea, they gave out sentence against him, *ver.*18. *It pertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense to the Lord, but to the Priests the sons of* Aaron, *that are consecrated to burn incense; go out of the sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed*, they give out the sentence *of the Law of God*, Numb.16.40, Nor might any *come in to the*

the Holy place, but the Priests and Levites, Num. 18. 6, 7. here is a sentence judiciall by the voyces of 80. Priests in an externall court, given out against the supream Magistrate: for they gave not out this sentence as private men, but as Priests, judging according to the Law, and in this the King was subject to Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction.

Erastus. *It is a vaine thing to say, they Excommunicate not the Magistrate as the Magistrate, none but Kata-baptists and such as deny Magistracy to be an Ordinance of God, can say that: Every man might excuse rebellion so, and say, I persecute not the Magistrate as he is a Magistrate, but as he is a tyrant: But I say you may not reproach the Magistrate*, Exod. 22. *farre lesse may you punish him. How can I obey him, whose whole life and actions, I may by Power, and coaction limit? The Magistrate so is but a servant to the Presbytery.* Page 301.

Anſ. *Erastus* scorneth this distinction, to say, the Magistrate not as a Magistrate, but as a scandalous man is Excommunicated: Yet we can make him receive the distinction whether he will or not: For *Erastus* saith, that Pastors may rebuke, convince, and threaten the Magistrate? Good man, may Pastors threaten and rebuke the Magistrate as the Magistrate? or may they only threaten, and rebuke him as an offending man? *Erastus* dare not say the first, for so he were a grosse Kata-baptist, for then Pastors were to rebuke the very office, and to condemne it; if he say the latter, as he doth in expresse words, then he acknowledgeth that Pastors may bind the sinnes of wicked Magistrates in heaven, is this, good *Thoma*, no Ecclesiasticall coaction, no jurisdiction? and this is to receive the distinction whether you will or not. 2. The rejecting of this distinction is a tenet of Royalists, for certainly we use no defensive armes against the King as King, but as he is a misled man; and I think the King will say, he useth not offensive armes against the Parliament as the Parliament, but under another very undeserved notion, as Rebels. 3. It is lesse that we may not rail on rulers, which is a sinne, (for to rail upon any cursing-wise is unlawfull) then that we cannot punish the ruler, which is more? To punish the ruler as a sinfull and wicked man, is a work of justice, and so lesse unlawfull then sin. *Erastus* taketh for confessed (as his custome is) that which we deny, that to punish rulers with an Ecclesiastick censure is a sin, as to rail on them, and curse them is a greater sin.

Page 300. Erastus, *Quis unquam dubitavit, an Ministris liceat improbe agentes, Magistratus, ex verbo Dei, objurgare, arguere, reprehendere, increpare, adeoque solvere & ligare?*

But to binde the rulers sinnes in heaven, is a punishment, and this the Elders may lawfully do, and to eschew the company of a ruler, if he be a fornicator, an extortioner, and idolater, is either to punish him, or put shame upon him, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. But one private Christian, farre more a Church may do that, *Rom.* 16. 17. 1 *Cor.*5.9,10. 2 *Thes.*3.14. except *Erastus* except the Magistrate from being under a Divine and Apostolick command; this he must say, and so we have the Apostles meaning; *Withdraw from those that cause divisions, and walk unordinately, and are fornicators, coveteous, extortioners, least they infect you, and that they may be ashamed, and repent, except they be* Magistrates, *though in the lowest rank; if they be Magistrates, they are gods, and you their subjects, and you may in no sort shame them.* I should think God both accepted persons, and would not have us to indeavour the repentance and gaining of the souls of Magistrates, because they are above Gospel-rules by this way of *Erastus*; and because the Presbytery may not rail on Magistrates, for that is sinne, it followeth not, the Presbytery may inflict no Ecclesiasticall censure on them; Yea, let me retort this, The Magistrate may not rail on, or curse and revile the Priests; So *Paul* expoundeth it, *Act.*23.5. against reviling of Priests, nor may the Magistrate revile or curse any subject, for I conceive reviling to be sinne, *Mat.*5. 11. *and* 27. 39. *Joh.* 9. 28. 1 *Cor.*4.12. 1 *Pet.*2.23. 1 *Cor.*6.10. *Isai.*51.7. *Zepha.*2. 8. 1 *Pet.* 3.9. *Jude* 9. and the Magistrate is under the Moral Law. Hence I inferre by *Erastus* his reasoning, that the Magistrate may not punish, Priests, Prophets, Pastors, or any subject, though they most hainously trespasse against all Lawes, which is absurd. 3. That the Magistrate is made a servant, not a Magistrate, if the Elders may use the rod of Christ against him is a vaine consequence; *Paul* preached himself a servant, in a spirituall Ministery, to all the Christians in *Corinth*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 5. and all Elders are thus servants to Magistrates and flock; Yet *Erastus* knoweth that *Paul* had a rod of miraculous killing the disobedient, as *Erastus* expoundeth, 1 *Cor.* 5.& 1 *Cor.*4. 21. *What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love?* Suppose there had been a Christian Magistrate at *Corinth* that should fall in incest, as one did, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. *Paul* could not come to him with the rod; or suppose the Roman Emperour had been a Christian and within the Church, and should have his Fathers

thers wife; *Paul* could use no rod against him, and should he not have in readinesse revenge against all disobedience? 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. and authority, ἐξουσία, given him by the Lord for edification, *v.* 8. against all offenders within the Christian Church? in regard that Christ is head and King of the Church; but he should have neither rod nor revenge in readinesse against the disobedience of the Emperour? why, is not the rod of *Paul* the rod of Christ? 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. yea certainly, is not then the Christian Emperour the subject of Christs Kingdome? and subject to the King Christ, and his rod? No, but (saith *Erastus*) *Paul*, Is the Emperour subject to thee? and if *Paul* should have a rod to punish the Emperour, then the Apostle could not be the Emperours subject, nor obey him as a God on earth: for (saith *Erastus*,) no subject may punish the Magistrate. This is downe right to make God an accepter of persons, nor can *Erastus* deny but sharp rebuking was a punishment, *Tit.* 1. *Rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith*; And this the Apostle urgeth all Ministers and watchmen to do, not being afraid of the faces of Kings, *Iere.* 1. 17, 18. *Jon.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. *Erastus* teacheth Magistrates to break Christs bounds, and to say, *We will not have this man to reigne over us*, he needed not employ a wicked pen for this, they need no teacher, *vitia discuntur sine Magistro.*

Erastus. *Some of yours say, there is need of the Magistrates consent to Excommunication, but certainly he will never consent to be Excommunicated himself*; Theodosius *was not willing, nor will good Magistrates consent, when they see the danger on themselves, you would not bring in again the Church-penances of the ancients.*

Page 302. 303. How the Magistrates consent is requisite in Excommunication.

Ans. 1. We all think the Cumulative consent of the godly Magistrate, is necessary to Excommunication: Because he is obliged to joyne his sanction and authority to all Christs Ordinances, but we think not the privative, or negative consent is required; so as no mans sinnes should be bound in heaven, except the Magistrate say Amen. 2. Put *Erastus* his Arguments in forme, and you shall see their weakenesse as thus: *He whose consent is required to Excommunication, cannot be punished with Excommunication himselfe, because no man will consent, not* Theodosius, *nor the godliest man, that he be punished himselfe*: *But the Magistrates consent (say the Presbyterians) is to be had to Excommunication*; Ergo, *the*

Magistrate cannot be punished with Excommunication himselfe.

Ans. I retort it, he whose consent is required for threatning wrath to, and rebuking of offenders and scandalous men, he is not to be threatned with wrath, and rebuked for his own offences and scandals; *because no man, no* Theodosius, *no godly Magistrate, when he seeth the present danger, will consent, that he be threatned with the wrath of God and rebuked himselfe; We know* Nathan *was afraid to rebuke a Magistrate according to Gods heart,* but in the third Person. But *Erastians* teach that the Magistrate, when he scandalously offends, should be threatned and rebuked; *Ergo,* the Magistrates consent is not requisite to threatnings and rebukings of Pastors. But the conclusion is against *Erastus*, for the Pastors preach, and rebuke, and threaten as the deputies and servants of the Magistrate, and as sent by him; and the Magistrate preacheth, rebuketh, threatneth all offenders, and himselfe also in and through Pastors as his servants, as *Erastus* teacheth; then he must consent, that they threaten and rebuke himselfe. 2. The proposition is false, it is presumed, all the subjects do consent to lawfull penall Lawes against sorcery, murther, incest in the generall, and virtually, that they shall be put in execution against themselves: yet the Sorcerer will never formally consent, that he himselfe be put to death, though he once, as a subject, consented to the Law, that all Sorcerers be put to death: For when the penall Law against sorcery was enacted, he consented to this. 3. He whose consent accumulative is requisite, that scandalous offenders in generall be Excommunicated, but not that this or this man, possibly the Magistrate himselfe, he is not to be Excommunicated, is most false; he whose consent negative, is requisite for Excommunication, he is not to be Excommunicated himself, the proposition is true; But I assume, the Magistrates consent negative, is requisite to Excommunication, there is nothing more false: For shall that which the Church bindeth on earth, not be bound in heaven, except the King, the Iustice, or Master Constable say Amen to it on earth? We say not that the Magistrates consent as a Magistrate, is requisite, for the Excommunicating of himselfe. For though as a Magistrate he ought to give his consent to Excommucate all offenders, and adde his civill sanction, as one of the seven wise men of Greece said, *Patere legem, quam ipse tuleris.* Yet he is not Excommunicated as a Magistrate (except with Kata-baptists,

you

you condemne the Office of Magistracie as an unlawfull Ordinance) but as a scandalous man. 3. The old penances, as they do us that service to make good that Excommunication was in the ancient Church, and that *Erastus* wanteth the authority of the Fathers, and upon his ingenuity should have been ashamed to cite them for his way, so we condemne them as introductory to Popery; but let *Erastus* forme an Argument from this, and logick shall hisse at it. *That which bringeth in old satisfactions and penance, is not to be holden. But Excommunication, or the Excommunicating of Magistrates doth this*; Ergo, The assumption must be proved.

Erastus. *It hath no more truth which you say, that the Magistrate, while he punisheth, cureth not the conscience, for God calleth many by tribulations to himselfe, and farre more then by your Excommunication.* Page 302. The Magistrats sword no kindly mean to gain souls, as Erastus dreameth.

Ans. I would *Erastus* had drawen up an Argument, which seldome he doth, for this it must be:

That which is a saving mean to gaine scandalous offenders to Jesus Christ, and better then Excommunication, is an Ordinance of God, and the other no Ordinance; *But the Magistrates punishing with the sword the scandalous offenders, is a saving meane to gaine scandalous offenders, and better then Excommunication*; Ergo,

Ans. Neither Major nor Minor proposition hath any truth at all. 1. Though the Magistrates sword were a better meane to gain souls, it followeth not that Excommunication is no mean. The Law is lesse powerfull for gaining souls, The Gospel more powerfull. But the Law is not for that no Ordinance of God. 2. *Erastus* his reason to prove, that the Magistrates punishing cureth the conscience, as a saving Ordinance, no lesse then Excommunication, must be this; *That, by which God calleth, and draweth many to himselfe, is a saving mean, to cure the conscience; but by the Magistrates punishing of scandalous men, God doth this as by other tribulations.* The proposition must be, a *propositio per se*; That by the Magistrates heading, and hanging, scourging, and imprisoning of themselves, as kindly and intrinsecally saving means, such as rebukes, promises, commands, excommunication are, the Lord calleth men, and converteth them, that is false, God no more useth the *Sword of the* Magistrate, as a kindly mean of gaining souls, then the sword of an oppressing Tyrant; so *Nebuchadnezzars* oppressing of the *Church*

of

of God, and the *Assyrians* unjust wasting of the *people of Israel*, shall be kindly means of gaining of souls; because God blessed the rod to many to humble their uncircumcised heart; but this is accidentall to, and beside the nature of the rod: but it is not accidentall to rebuking, threatning, promises to the preaching of the Gospel, nor to Excommunication to save souls and gaine them to Christ. The
Rom. 1.16. Gospel, and all the parts of it, are kindly, and of themselves the power of God to salvation: The Magistrates sword to *Erastus* must be the power of God to salvation, and Christ, *Matth.* 18. in his order of gaining an offending brothers soul, by this reason must descend, not ascend, contrary to the order of Christ, for Christ maketh the rebuking between brother and brother, to be the first step of gaining an offender to Christ. 2. The rebuking before two or three. 3. Before the Church. 4. Excommunication: Now all these are spirituall means and more efficacious, the second then the first, the third then the second, the fourth then any of them. But *Erastus* maketh Christ in the fourth step, to descend from three spirituall steps of gaining the mans soul, to a fourth, which is carnall, to wit, let him be as a heathen, &c. this is *Cæsars* sword, which certainly is a carnall weapon, proper to the Kingdomes of this world, *Ioh.* 18.36. whereas rebuking, exhorting, promises, and Excommunication, are the spirituall weapons of the warfare of the Ministers of Christ, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 8, 9. *Rev.* 1. 16. *Esai* 11. 4. *Psal.* 45. 4. *Rom.* 1. 16. The exercise of the sword is a mean of edifying *consequenter* by removing false teachers, that hindreth edification; but no man can say, it is a mean of it self, and kindly in regard of the man against whom the sword is used; Farther, that which is a common mean of conserving peace in all societies and corporations, even without the Church, where the Gospel was never heard, cannot be a kindly mean of gaining mens souls that are within the visible Church.

L. 5. *c.* 1. *p.* 302. 303. Erastus. *Ambrose following the example of* Azariah, *cannot be defended in debarring* Theodosius *from the Sacraments*; *Yea, it was tyranicall and damnable to debarre a man desirous to hear the word, who otherwayes repented and acknowledged his fault, from the means of salvation. It was like the Popes proud fact in trampling on the Emperours neck, he had no cause of wrath against* Theodosius, *but as* Nicephorus *saith, the Emperour hated* Ambrose.

Ans.

Anſ. 1. If *Eraſtus* had come to Logick, he refuteth here but a Law by a fact of *Ambroſe*. 2. What if *Ambroſe* debarred *Theodoſius* from hearing the word; *Ergo*, there is no Excommunication, it followeth not. 3. That he debarred *Theodoſius* from the Sacrament, after he gave evidences of his repentance to the Church, is an untruth. 4. That after ſuch a cruell fact of murthering ſo many innocent perſons of *Theſſalonica*, *Theodoſius* ſhould have been admitted to the Sacrament, or remained a Member of the Church, *to eat and drink his owne damnation*, and not be caſt out, as 1 *Cor.* 5. no man but *Eraſtus* could ſay: ſo it is cleare, that *Ambroſe* did no more then a faithfull Paſtor, and *Amariah* and the So. valiant Prieſts did, in not ſuffering the holy things of God to be polluted; *Lipſius*, no religious man, ſaith, *l.2.c.24. de Conſtantia, quo facto nihil magis impium omnis vetus impietas habuit.* Beza, Bucer, P. Martyr, Melancton, Calvin, Anto. Waleus, Gomaras, commend *Ambroſe*. And truly to kill ſeven thouſand Citizens of *Theſſalonica*, of which the moſt part were innocent, deſerved more then Excommunication, if more could be inflicted by the Church. See *Ambroſe*, Epiſt. 5. 28, 29. *Eraſtus* had no reaſon to compare ſo laudable a fact to the proud fact of an abominable *Pope* trampling on the Emperours neck, and abuſing the word of God, *Pſal.* 91. to defend his deviliſh pride.

CHAP. XX. Queſt. 16.

A vindication of other Arguments for Excommunication, *as from ſacrificing, offering of gifts, &c. with bloody hands.*

ERaſtus. *Eſay* 1. *c.*52. *c.*66. *Ier* .6. 7. *Ezech.*23. *and* 33. *Pſa.*50. *are alledged for Excommunication, to which I anſwer,* 1. *The Lord doth not condemne ſacrificing, for he commanded it, but the abuſe thereof; as he that commendeth modeſty to one that eateth undecently, doeth condemne unmannerly eating; but commandeth not abſtinence from eating; ſo Chriſt* Mat.6. *removeth not faſting and praying, but the abuſe of them.* Page 303, 304.

them. When the Hebrews *propound two just and right things, of which they approve the one, and deny the other; there is only a comparison understood, as* Hos. 6. *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, that is, rather mercy then sacrifice;* Prov. 8. *Receive my instruction, and not silver; that is. receive rather my instruction then silver: so this is no good consequence. God hateth the sacrifice of the wicked;* Ergo, *Presbyters are to be chosen, who should hinder wicked men to sacrifice: it followeth not, for then this should be as good a consequence; God hateth the prayers of the wicked;* Ergo, *Presbyters are to be chosen, who should hinder men to call upon God, to praise God, to rest on the* Sabbath, *to give almes, except these Presbyters judge them worthy.*

Ans. In the following books, *Erastus* refuteth some Treatises of Authors without names, the books I cannot have, and if he doe them right in repeating their minde faithfully, I know not; but I know in many things, and in this very argument *Erastus* fancied arguments on *Beza*, which he would reject as none of his. 1. Sacrificing seemeth to be a confirming ordinance, as eating the Passeover, and the Communion of the Lords bodie and blood; and as there was some examination of the persons for whom sacrifices were offered required in the Priests, as I said before, from *Mat.* 8. 4. *Levit.* 14. 3, 4. 9, 10, 11, 12. So there is Morall cleanneſſe required in all that are to partake of the Sacraments, that presupposeth conversion; and I grant the first and native consequence of these is, that it was the sin and hypocrisie of the persons themselves who sacrificed first and principally. But that it was not the sins of the Priests who admitted those that were no better then *Sodom* and *Gomorrah Esa.* 1. 10. and *had hands full of blood*, ver. 15. is now the question; I conceive that it is a taxing of the Priests and Church Rulers, that is, *Esa.* 1. 10. no lesse then of civill judges and the people, yea, that he rather taxeth the Priests called *Rulers*, v. 10. and that that is not as *Socinians* say, a new commandement of Christ, but an old, *Mat.* 5. 23. *Therefore if thou bring thy gift unto the Altar, and there remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee?* What if the Priest should know that he had killed

killed an innocent man, and beside the guilt of innocent blood, that the sad hearted widow, and the weeping Orphanes had any blood to charge him withall, was the Priest either to offer or sacrifice for him, while he were reconciled to the widdow and fatherlesse? *Christ* addeth *v.* 24. *Leave there thy gift before the Altar, and goe thy way, first πρῶτον be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy gift*: I offer it to the consideration of the Reader, if as the offerer of the gift was to leave his offering, knowing himself to be under blood, and to have offended his brother, he was to leave his offering at the Altar, so if the Priest who offered the same should also know that the same day he had offered his childe to *Molech* or the Devill; if the Priest in this case should offer for him, and if the Priest should not eat this mans sin, and communicate with the bloody impenitent man in offering with him, and for him the sacrifice of fools; if he should not leave offering for him till he went and was reconciled with his brother, for the Priest by office was to forbid such a bloodie man to offer; *Ergo*, he could not by office, also offer for him. Here an order prescribed that is morall, perpetuall, and common both to the ordinances of the Old and New Testament, for Christ doth here expound the Law, which was corrupted by the *Pharisees*. 2. He doth not set down a rule concerning the *Ceremoniall Law*, which was shortly to be abrogated, but sure he hath an eye to the worship of the New Testament. What if he that is come to the Table to eat and drinke with Christ, and both his owne conscience and the Elders remember the widdow & orphane have a just accusation against this man of late, yesterday, he killed their husband and father, should either this man eat and drinke at this time with Iesus Christ? or should the Elders give these holy things to him? I thinke not. And to come to the argument, it is true, *Isa.* 1. sacrificing is not condemned, but sacrificing by such Princes of *Sodom* and *tali modo*, by men of bloodie hands; *Ergo*, they were not to abstaine from sacrificing, but at that time and in that condition; nor doe we forbid either coming to, or debarring from the Lords Table by the Elders, but onely *hac vice*, and onely while πρῶτον *first he be reconciled to his brethren*, and testifie that he repenteth, we never heighten Excommunication to such an extremity, as it doth totally unchurch the man, and exclude him from the Seals *simpliciter* and absolutely

solutely, but according to Christs πρῶτον and his order, and therefore the Elders are to exclude for a time just as this, *God will have mercy and not sacrifice, that is, rather mercy, first mercy,* and *first faith and repentance*; then *sacrifice,* that is, then *afterward externall worship,* afterward receiving of the Passeover, the Lords Supper, and offering of gifts at the Altar. And secondarily even in the second place, in regard of time, he will have all these externalls; whence the man is to debarre himselfe, and by the same reason the Elders as the 80. Priests did to a King, 2. *Chron.* 26. are to debarre the man while he repent: And 2. This also, *I will have mercy, and not Sacrifice,* or, *I will have mercy rather then Sacrifice,* doth imply that both mercy and Sacrifice are lawfull, and acceptable to God in their owne order and way. But where saith God, *I will have sacrificing rather then sacrificing with bloody hands,* so as both sacrificing, and sacrificing with bloody hands, shall be lawfull and acceptable to God in their owne order? for Sacrificing with bloodie hands was never lawfull, never acceptable to God in any order. Nor said God ever he would chuse the coming of those to his Sanctuary, who the same day they came in had slaughtered their sonnes to *Moloch*? God alwaies hated it, and never chose it; if at the same time both mercy and sacrifice cannot be, as *David* starving cannot both abstaine from eating shewbread, as the Law in its letter required, and shew mercie to his life, and the life of his followers, and eate, yea, he is to eate, and the Priests knowing his case, doe give him the Shewbread to eat, & forbid abstinence, as they would forbid selfe-murthering, and selfstarving, so here, where at one time eating at the Lords Table, and reconciliation with the widow and fatherlesse, cannot be co-existent together at one time and place, an exigence of divine providence forbidding both, the bloodie man is to debarre himselfe from the Lords Supper, it being as sacrificing and lesse necessary if we speake comparatively; and the Elders are not to give those holy things to the bloodie man, while πρῶτον, *first he be reconciled* to the widow and Orphane, which now comparing the one with the other is mercy, whereas eating and drinking at the Lords Supper is but Sacrifice, but it should be as *sacrificing with bloodie hands,* which God condemneth and forbiddeth, and the *Priests* and *Elders* knowing it to be such a sinne, ought to forbid and to hinder

hinder it: Hence as this, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, hath this sense, *I will have you to omit Sacrifice, when it cannot be done without neglect of mercie, which is more acceptable to me then all Sacrifices; so I will have reconciliation to the offended Widdow and Orphanes, and not coming to the Lords Supper without the former*; for the former is more acceptable to me, and should be to you and the Elders in your practice, then the latter; and therefore the comparison of eating, and eating undecently halteth; for eating undecently before another, which would procure deadly sickness to your brother, ought to be forbidden by the Ruler, it being known to be so, and ought to be abstained from *hic & nunc*, as a sinne, and a hurting of your brothers health, and yet the Ruler cannot forbid totall abstinence from meat to him that eateth undecently, as the Elders cannot command to all abstinence from the Sacraments ἀεὶ καὶ πανλάχε *alwayes and in all cases.* 2. We draw no conclusion of erecting a Presbytery from those places, but those two we draw; *Ergo*, 1. It is a sin to the people themselves to sacrifice with bloodie hands, because God condemneth such a manner of sacrificing. 2. *Ergo*, they are to be debarred by some who hath the *charge of the holy things of God*, but from the Antecedent, we neither inferre; *Ergo*, Presbyters, nor, *Ergo*, the people, nor, *Ergo*, the Prince should debarre them. 3. *Calling on God* is not to be forbidden, nor giving of almes, because they are abused, but the manner of the abusing those ordinances are forbidden by God, and may be hindred by the Church, and forbidden under the pain of Excommunication. The Church cannot forbid men of totall abstinence from the Lords Supper, but they can command him that is not reconciled to his brother, and visibly under the guilt of blood, to leave the Table, as Christ *Mat.* 5.23. commandeth the unreconciled man *to leave his gift at the Altar, and goe first be reconciled with his brother*, and then at the next occasion, come to the Lords Supper; so the Church of the Iewes could not forbid the *Pharisees* to pray, but they could passe such an act, as is, *Act.* 15. 22. *We forbid Pharisees or any other to bring their private prayers to the Markets and streets, and when they are to give almes, we forbid them with sound of Trumpet to make proclamation to all men that they are the onely holy and charitable men in the earth.* Nor doe we thinke that the Church can debarre men from the Sa-

craments for inward and and inviſible unworthineſſe; but onely for viſible and profeſſed uncleanneſſe; and *Levit.* 9. 13. it is clear, the man that is uncleane is forbidden to keepe the Paſſeover. Will *Eraſtus* ſay, O he is not forbidden to eate the Paſſeover, but onely he is forbidden to eat it *tali modo* being unclean? and therefore it is not the Prieſts ſinne if he ſhould give the Paſſeover to the uncleane man, and forbid him to eate *tali modo*, in his uncleanneſſe? ſee *Eraſtus* himſelfe againſt this, *lib.* 1. *c.* 3. *page* 103. 104. where he confeſſeth that the *unclean are debarred*, and yet uncleannes in the eaters of the Paſſeover, was an abuſe onely, and made not eating of the Paſſeover unlawfull in it ſelf.

So the Lord complaineth, *Ezek.* 23. 38. *Moreover this they have done unto me, they have defiled my Sanctuary in the ſame day, and have prophaned my Sabbaths.* 39. *For when they had ſlaine their children to their Idols, then they came* ביום ההוא *in the ſame very day into my Sanctuary to prophane it; and loe this they have done in the midſt of my houſe.* Will *Eraſtus* now ſay, It was Ceremoniall uncleannes, not Morall, *to kill their ſeed to Molech*; and that Morall uncleanneſſe and bloodie murthering of their ſeed in the ſame day when a perſon is to come to the Lords ſupper, known to be ſuch a Murtherer to the Elders who have power to judge the ſcandalous and to caſt him out, 1 *Cor.* 5. did not ſinne, if they ſhould be inſtrumentall to lead Murtherers into the Temple? and ſay to them, *Take yee, eate yee, this is the body of the Lord that is broken for you?*

page 305. *Eraſtus* anſwereth, *The Prophet* Ezek. 23. *accuſeth not the Prieſts or Elders, that they debarred not thoſe Murtherers from the Temple and Sacraments, if there had been any precept for this, ſome footſtep ſhould have appeared in Gods rebuking of them.*

Anſ. The Lord doth not particularly reprove the Prieſts by name in every place, in which he reproveth the people: But expreſly for this ſame very ſinne, the Lord reproveth the Prieſts, *Ezek.* 44. 7. *Let it ſuffice you, that ye have brought into my ſanctuary ſtrangers uncircumciſed in heart, and uncircumciſed in fleſh, to be in my ſanctuary to pollute it* -- 8. *And ye have not kept the charge of my holy things; but ye have ſet keepers of my charge, in my ſanctuary, for your ſelves.* 24. *And in controverſie they ſhall ſtand in judgement* (he had ſpoken of their teaching the people to diſcerne *be-*

The Morally unclean debarred out of the temple.

tween.

tween the clean and the unclean, v. 23.) *and they shall judge it according to my judgements, and they shall keep my Laws and my Statutes in all mine assemblies, and hallow my Sabbaths,* so 2 Chron. 23. 19. *And* Iehojada *set the porters at the Gates of the house of the Lord, that none which was uncleane in any thing should enter in.* And shall we conceive that porters, that is, Levites, would hold out those that were only ceremonially unclean, and receive in murtherers who had killed there Children to *Molech* that same day? there was not to enter in לבל דבר טמא the unclean in any matter; the text is generall, excludes idolaters and murthers, and such as should refuse to enter in Covenant with the Lord, of which the Text speaketh. As for *Erastus* his consequence, which he unjustly imputeth to us, to wit; Israel *sinned in coming to the Lords temple to prophane it, in the very day that they slew their Children to* Molech; Ergo, *there ought to have been Priests, and now there must be Presbyters and selected overseers in a Church judicature to debarre murtherers, and the like scandalous persons from the Sacraments.* 1. This is not our consequence. But this we say, if the Priests knew that same day, that they came to the Temple, *they slew their Children to* Molech, the Priests should have debarred them from coming to the Temple, and from eating the Passeover, as their office and duty was by the Law of God, *Num.* 9. v. 6, 7. *Num.* 19. 11, 12. *Lev.* 22. 6. *The soul that hath touched any such (unclean) shalbe unclean till even, and shall not eat of the holy things, unlesse he wash his flesh with water,* 7. *and when the Sun is downe, he shalbe clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things, because it is his food:* Now it was the Priests office, *Lev.* 10. 10. *that he put a difference between holy and unholy, and between clean and unclean;* so if *Eli* knew that his sonnes *made themselves vile before the people, and committed fornication with the women at the doore of the Tabernacle of the Congregation;* Ergo, *Eli* should as a judge have restrained them, 1 *Sam.* 3. 13. But from this antecedent, we draw not this consequence, *Elies sonnes do publikely make themselves vile;* Ergo, *there ought to be such an Ordinance as a judge, with Civill power to punish them,* and Ergo, there ought to have been no King to punish them, but a judge like unto *Eli* and *Samuel;* this consequence followeth not from this antecedent, but only *hoc posito,* that *Eli* hath the sword, and be the Civill judge; *Ergo,* he ought to punish from scandals in the Church, and prophaning

ning the holy things of God, we inferre not; *Ergo*, there must be such a judicature erected, as if the antecedent were the cause of the consequent. But this only followeth; *Ergo*, supposing there be a Church and Presbytery invested with this power, they ought not to admit murtherers, or any unclean persons to come and partake of the Sacraments, and so *defile the holy things of God*: as for the place *Ezek.* 33. I undertake not from thence to conclude debarring of any from the holy things of God by the Priests, what may follow by consequent is another thing.

Page 305. Erastus. *Whereas it is said*, Deut. 23. *the Lord would not have the price of a whore offered to him*; Ergo, *far lesse would he have a whore admitted to the sacrifice: it followeth not, but a penitent, or a whore, professing repentance, may be admitted to the sacrifices.* 2. *He forbiddeth only the price of a whore to be offered to him as a vow, or a thing vowed, it may be that agree not to all sacrifices: For God forbiddeth a living creature, that is unperfect, in a vow*; *But* Lev. 22. *he forbiddeth not such imperfect living creatures to be offered to him, in a free will-sacrifice, so God forbiddeth honey to be offered in an offering by fire, but not in all other oblations. But will not the Lord have a whore to offer to God that which is lawfully purchased, or which is her patrimony? or may not a whore offer her first borne to the Lord, or circumcise him? We find not that forbidden. From things to persons we cannot argue; we may not offer a lame beast to God*; Ergo, *doth the Lord so abhor a lame man, that he may not come to the Temple? God alloweth not tares amongst the wheat, yet he will not have the externall Ministers to pluck up the tares while harvest.*

No price of a whore to be offered to God; what it meant.

Ans. If the hire received for a whores selling of her body to uncleanneſſe, must not be applyed to the service of God, farre more cannot a whore as a whore be admitted to partake of the holy things of God, for the price or money is called abomination to God, *Deut.* 23. for the whore, not the whore for the money; and so we may well argue from the things to the persons. 2. It is false that God forbiddeth the price of a whore onely in vows, and

not

not in sacrifices; he forbiddeth it because as *Moses* saith, *Deut.* 23. 18. it is an abomination to the Lord, and as *Erastus* saith, it is money unjustly purchased; Yea, *Davids* practise teacheth, that what we bestow on sacrifices, as well as in vows, it must be our own proper goods, and not so much as gifted to us, 2 *Sam.* 24. 24. *Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which cost me nothing*; farre lesse would he offer the price of a whore in sacrifices; and the Divines of *England* say on the place, *hereby is forbidden that any gaine of evill things should be applied to the service of God*, Mich. 7. 1. *Vatablus* saith the like. 2. For the Lords forbidding to offer in a vow, Bullock or Lambe, or any thing that is superfluous, or lacking in his parts, and permitting it in a free-will offering, by a free will offering, is meant that which is given to the Priest for food, of a free gift; but otherwise, what is offered to the Lord in a vow, or a free will offering must be perfect: *for the blind, broken, maimed, having a wenne, scurvy, or scab, can in no sort be offered to the* Lord, Lev. 22. 20, 21, 22, 23. There is no word of the Lord in the free will gift that *Erastus* speaketh of, but only the word נדב is liberall, free, from נדב to give freely to God or man. 3. A whore repenting or professing repentance, was not debarred from sacrifices; but that is without the bounds of the question, an heathen could say, *Quem penitet facti is pene innocens est.* Senec. in Traged. We debarre none that professe repentance from the seals of the Covenant. 4. When a whore as a whore did offer her first borne being a bastard in the Temple, I conceive neither she nor her childe were accepted, Deut. 23. 2. *A bastard shall not enter into the Congregation of the* Lord: if the childe was born of Married Parents, the woman repenting, the question now must be far altered. 5. For a lame man to be a Priest, we can say something, but that all the lame in *Israel* were debarred from the Temple, and the holy things of God, we dare not say; and a difference of things and men we acknowledge, but that is nothing to weaken the argument. 6. How proveth *Erastus* the tares are not to be plucked up by men? *Mat.* 13. will bear no such thing: ill men are to be cast out of the Church before the day of judgement, both by the Magistrate and miraculously by the Apostles, and by Excommunication say we, *Mat.* 18. 1 *Cor.* 5.

Annot. an. 1645. *an. on Deut.* 23. 18. Vata. *in loc. que injustè parta sunt, nullo modo offerri debent Deo.*

Erastus. *He that possesseth the price of the whore, is not to be debarred*

debarred out of the Temple, though the money could not be offered to God. The Pharisees would not have the price of blood cast in the treasure of the Temple; yet they cast not Judas *out of the Temple, which these patrons of Ceremonies would have done, if there had been any Law for it.*

Ans. This is to beg the question, the whore who sold her body for a price was unclean, and more unclean then the innocent money, and so in that case excluded from the holy things of God. 2. They admitted doves, oxen, and money changers into the Temple and prophaned it, and why should they cast *Judas* out of the Temple? will their practises prove any thing, they used all divine ceremonies and Lawes of God to their owne carnall ends.

Page 307. Erastus. *Heathens were not admitted into the Temple, But a scandalous man is a heathen,* Ezech. 16. *Your Father was an* Ammorite; *also, if thou be a transgressour of the Law, thy circumcision is become uncircumcision,* Rom. 2. *he is worse then an Infidell,* 1 Tim. 5. Erastus *answereth, but if we look to Gods estimation, wicked brethren are worse then pagans. But if we consider the externall face of the Church, there be many things in wicked men that agreeth not to heathen, wicked circumcised men might go in to the Temple. Gentiles might not; so the assumption is most false.* 2. *A circumcised man and a Baptised man, can never turn non-circumcised, or non-baptised.*

Ans. I say nothing to the cursing and blessing *Deut.* 27. Nor do I owne that Argument; it is not ours. 2. Those which are (so our argument runneth) as Heathens and Publicans, as *Pagans, Ammorites,* whereas they were sometimes Brethren and Members of the Church, are not to be admitted to the Sacraments, nor to be acknowledged as members of the Church more then Heathen, *Ammorites,* Pagans are to be be admitted to the Sacraments and Members of the Church. But wicked men amongst the Iewes, and amongst us Christians, who will not hear the Church and are fornicators, idolaters, railers, drunkards, and extortioners, and walke inordinately, and cause divisions contrary to the Gospel

Our chiefe argument for excommunication not answered.

Gospell of our Lord Iesus, are to be esteemed as *Heathens, Pagans, Amorites*, and worse then Infidels; therefore such amongst the Iewes were not admitted to the Temple and holy things of God, and amongst us not to be admitted to the Sacraments, nor to be acknowledged as members of the Church. *Erastus* answereth not to this Argument, either Major or Assumption, but propoundeth an Argument of a nameless Author, as he knoweth best to answer and remove himself. 2. *Many things* (saith he) *agree to Pagans and Turks which agree not to scandalous Christians.* True, scandalous Christians are not *Amorites* and *Pagans simpliciter*, they differ in profession, the one being baptized, not the other; and once being baptized, they can never be unbaptized; but that is not our Argument, but they agree in this, that they are no more really Christians, being fornicators, railers, drunkards, extortioners, &c. then Pagans, but have the onely name and title of such, and are to be esteemed so by us, and are to us *quoad hoc*, in regard of Church priviledges, as *heathens and publicans*, and so the Lord of old termed his Apostate people *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, *Esa.* 1. 10. and *as the children of the* Ethiopians *and* Philistines, *Amos* 9. 7. and as uncleane and uncapable in a Church way of the Passeover, and now of the Lords Supper to us, as *Ethiopians, Sodomites* of old, and this day Turks and Pagans are to us. 3. That the wicked that were circumcised might go into the Temple amongst the Iews, *de facto*, they might, but *de jure*, by Law, they might not, *Ier.* 7. 9. *Ezek.* 23. 39. *Esa.* 66. 3. no more then by Law they might prophane the holy Name of God, or kill a man, *or sacrifice a dog to God, or offer swines blood, or blesse an Idoll*, The argument from sanctifying the *Sabbath* I passe, it hath no sense nor reason as *Erastus* propoundeth it.

Erastus. *Christ* Mat. 5. *commandeth him who is to offer a gift, to leave his gift at the Altar, and first to be reconciled to his brother*; Ergo, *he will have us not to use the Sacraments while we be first reconciled to our Brother. But so* (saith Erastus) *we should not pray to God, nor seeke forgivenesse of sinnes, while we first forgive those that have wronged us; Christ doth not here speake of the externall governing of his* Page 308. 309. The place Matth. 5. When thou bringest thy gift, &c. discussed.

Church, but of the perfection of a Christian man, else wee could doe nothing that is good and just, and we were all to be Excommunicated, he saith not, if the Presbyters shall command; leave thy gift, but if thou shalt call to minde thy selfe; he speaketh not of a prohibition of others discharging an instituted worship, but of that which a mans owne minde doth enjoyne him, you may as easily prove the Papists Masse from this, as Excommunication.

Ans. Surely this is to me convincing, if I be discharged by the Holy Ghost to *meddle with the holy things of God*, or offering a gift to God at his Altar, while I first be reconciled to my brother; then those who have by office power to steward those holy things, in wisedome, and fidelity, *putting a difference betweene the precious and the vile*, knowing that I am at wrath with my brother, and having convinced me before two or three Witnesses that I have highly trespassed against my brother, are to deny to Steward or dispense any such holy thing to me, while I be first reconciled to my brother; and the like I say of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. 2. To *Erastus* his Argument, I answer, it is not alike here as in praying, for praying is so absolutely necessary, that it obligeth by a command of God, even a *Simon Magus* to pray, while he is *in the gall of bitternesse, that the thoughts of his heart may be forgiven*, Act. 8. 22. But *Erastus*, as if he had set himselfe to contradict Christ, would insinuate as much, as Christ were not to be obeyed, for his Exposition holdeth forth this sense, *When thou bringest thy gift unto the Altar, and remembrest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave not thy gift, depart not, goe not about to be reconciled to thy Brother, but first offer thy gift*; But *Simon Magus*, though he should remember that he was in *the gall of bitternesse*, should not delay to pray till he were first delivered *from the gall of bitternesse*, and then pray: Sure if *Peter* had said to *Simon Magus, First labour to be freed of the gall of bitternesse, and to have thy thoughts pardoned, and then pray that the thoughts of thy heart may be pardoned*, as Christ saith, First bee reconciled to thy brother, and then offer; and (as *Paul* saith) First, *Let a man try and examine himselfe, and so let him eate and drinke*, the reply of *Erastus*

ſtus ſhould have nerves. 2. It is true, Chriſt ſpeaketh not of the externall government of the Church; but it is as falſe that he ſpeaketh of the internall acts of the minde; but he ſpeaketh of the right ordering of the externall acts of divine worſhip, which are regulable, though not *quatenus*, as regulable by the Church, and draweth an argument from the words by neceſſary conſequence, which conſequence *Eraſtus* cannot elude. 3. But how doth *Eraſtus* prove this conſequence, if our Expoſition ſtand, and if we were to doe nothing in *offering gifts at the Altar, except we bee firſt reconciled to our brother, and if God approve nothing which we doe, which deviates from this perfection, we ſhould doe nothing that is good and right, and ſo all muſt be excommunicated.* 1. Is Chriſt here injoyning a work of perfection, and of ſupererogation? Is *Eraſtus* popiſh in this? 2. As it is impoſſible not to offer gifts aright, ſo is it not to eate and drinke worthily, while firſt we be reconciled to our brother: *Eraſtus* was ſo ſurfetted with charity, as we heard before, that *if any but deſire the Sacrament and profeſſe repentance, he thinketh he is obliged to beleeve he is fit for the Lords Supper*; and here, if Chriſt require, but that the partie be reconciled to his brother, ere he offer his gift and come to the Sacrament, this is too great ſtrictneſſe, it ſhould excommunicate us all, and we ſhall ſo never doe any thing that is right and good. 4. It is falſe that Chriſt ſpeaketh here of internall acts onely, and of that which our minde injoyneth, for the Lord ſpeaketh of three externall viſible acts; 1. Of offering a gift at the Altar. 2. Of delaying and ſuſpending of the offering. 3. Of a previous viſible reconciliation to an offended brother. 5. He ſaith not, *if the Presbyters bid you*, (ſaith he) *leave your offering*; true, he ſaith not that in words; but ſuppoſing this, that the Presbyters know that the ſame very day that he bringeth his offering, he had beene killing his owne ſonne to *Molech*, as *Ezek.* 23. 38, 39. Whether were the Presbyters to forbid him to come and offer, while he ſhould teſtifie his repentance; and finding him impenitent; whether ſhould they not judge him both to be debarred from the holy things of God, and to be caſt out of the Church, as 1 *Cor.* 5. Certaine this is Chriſts order, *Be firſt reconciled to thy Brother, and then offer; try thy ſelfe firſt, and then eate*; and if the Church ſee this order neglected, whether are they to ſuf-

fer clean and unclean to come and eat, and holy things to be prophaned?

Page 309. 310. Eraſtus. *He ſhall expede himſelfe out of this doubt eaſily, who can diſtinguiſh the internall governing of the Church, which is proper to God onely who knoweth the thoughts and can judge them without error, from the externall governing of the Church,* in qua falli infinitè omnes poſſumus *in the which we may all infinitely erre, and in which we can doe nothing,* niſi quod mandatum expeſſè nobis legimus, *except what vve read to be expreſly commanded, for here he vvho is not againſt us is vvith us,* Marke 9. *and no man ought to forbid thoſe which God hath commanded, ſo they bee externally done, all externall actions* quoad nos, *to us are good vvhich are done according to the preſcript of Gods Word, though to God vvho judgeth the heart they be not good every vvay; many to day, the Phariſees of old; many in* Pauls *time preach for gaine, many are ambitious, and ſome out of envy preach; Chriſt never forbad them to teach, nor* Paul *but rejoyced,* Phil. 1. *that Chriſt was preached; hovvever ſince no man can underſtand the internall actions or thoughts, and without error judge them, there is no puniſhment by mans Law for them; onely God, vvithout error, judgeth and puniſheth them.*

How men doe judge of inward actions.

Anſ. There be many untruths here, 1. If this diſtinction of internall and externall governing of the Church, remove moſt of the doubts here; he that eates and drinkes unworthily, which is an act of externall worſhip, which may be regulated and ordered by the Church, (for the Church may not adminiſter the Sacraments to Pagans without the Church) is no ſinne to the unworthy eater, becauſe God commanded that externall act expreſly, as *Eraſtus* ſaith, and ſo it is a good action, *quoad nos*, even to the unworthy eater, for he knoweth not his owne thoughts, nor can he judge them without error, eſpecially being unregenerated. 2. If *Eraſtus* himſelfe acknowledge this his owne diſtinction, he muſt acknowledge an externall Church-government, and who then are the Governours, eſpecially in the Apoſtolick-Church, where

where heathen Magistrates are? Pastors and Teachers no doubt, what meaneth this then? my Brother trespasseth against me and will not be gained? I tell the Church; (*Erastus* saith) I tell the Christian Magistrate, but there is no Christian Magistrate, then there was no externall Government in the Church the first hundreth, nay, nor three hundred yeers in the Church, or then it must follow, that the Apostles and Pastors were the deputies of heathen Magistrates: *Ergo*, the heathen Magistrates should with imposition of hands have been ordained the officers, κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, in every Church. And that they were not, it was their owne fault; for the principall officer must be more principally called to office by Christ, and given by him as a gift, when he ascended on high, to edifie the body of the Church, *Eph.*4.11. 3. *Erastus* will have men debarred from judging the inward actions, because God only can judge them, *sine errore*, without error: But so God only should judge all things internall and externall, and there should be no Magistrates, because men may erre in judging the externall actions of men, and will not this gratifie the Papists, who say in this; Tell the Church, that is, the Pope who cannot erre. Then the Synod cannot erre, Protestants deny the consequence; Synods may judge, as *Act.*15. and yet Synods may erre. 4. *Erastus* will have us lyable to infinite errors in externall actions: therefore (saith he) we should do nothing in externalls, but what is expresly commanded; but first may we not *infinite falli*, infinitely erre in internall actions and thought, and acts of beleeving? are we more infallible in internall, then in externall actions? New Theologie: and are we not as well tyed to what is expresly commanded in internall, as in externall actions? I think the word is as strict a rule, and the Law of the Lord as perfect in the one as in the other. 5. The great error is here, that *Erastus* being sleeping when he wrote, thinketh that to eat and drinke unworthily, to offer a gift at the Altar, the offerer being unreconciled to his brother, is an action internall and known to God; and that can no more be known to man, then the thoughts of the heart: A palpable untruth! is not worshipping of *Baalim*, murthering, stealing, whoring, killing the Children to *Molech*, and coming to stand in the Temple of the Lord, which are called a prophaning of Gods holy name, *Ier.*7. 9, 10, 11. *Ezek.*23. 38, 39. are not these actions visible, externall, and as feazable to be judged by man,

Page 310. *Solus deus ut sine errore cogitationes judicat, ita eadem quoque punit,*

Ib. *In rectione externa ecclesiæ infinite falli omnes possumus, quamobrem facere hic nihil debemus, quam mandatum expresse nobis legimus.*

man, as murther may be judged by a Magistrate? Yea, by this, let a Pagan come to the table of the Lord, we are not to hinder him, why? it is an internall action knowne, *citra errorem*, to God only, and we cannot then judge whither he have examined himself or not; if he be not against us here, he is with us saith *Erastus*, *Quod deus facere jussit, ab eo revocari aut retrahi nullus ab hominibus debet: si modo externe sic fiat, ut precepit deus*; Yea, so the Magistrate cannot hinder either Pagan or the open enemy, and persecutor, who will trample upon the Sacrament, from the Sacraments; the contrary whereof *Erastus* said, pag. 207. *hunc ego minime admittendum censeo*, and let *Erastus* give us Scripture, either expresse, or by consequence, where a Pagan or a persecutor may be impeded by Church or Magistrate from externall receiving of the seals, except that we are not to give pearls to swine? But was it not as hard to judge whether *Saul* persecuting the Church out of blind zeal, was a swine, or a dogge, as to judge whether he that killeth his sonne to *Molech* out of blind devotion, and cometh the same day to the Temple of the Lord, doth prophane the Name of the Lord? 6. If we must do nothing in externalls without the expresse commandement of God, nor may we without Gods command, either expresse, or a necessary consequence, admit dogs and swine to the Lords table. 7. *Paul* indeed rejoyced that *Christ was preached, though out of envy*, Phil. 1. but by men called and gifted of God to preach, and therefore ought not to be forbidden to preach, while the Church, for their scandalous life do cast them out; say they are called Ministers once, the Church is not to cast them out, for this or that particular sinne, if they be not contumatious, and *Paul*, saith he, *Rejoyceth that Christ was preached*; but he saith not, he rejoyced that they preached Christ, *tali modo, out of contention, thinking to add affliction to his bonds.* Yet God forbiddeth the externall act of preaching in those that hateth to be reformed, *Psal.* 50. 16, 17. and forbiddeth the Church to lay hands on, or to call to the Ministery, wicked men that hateth to be reformed, or to keep them in the Ministery; and this hindreth not, but *Paul* might rejoyce at the consequent of their Ministery, to wit, at the preaching of the Gospel, so long as they remained in the Ministery: as we may rejoyce in that Christ was crucified for sinners, and not allow that *Herod and Pilate did with wicked hands crucifie the Lord of Glory*, nor yet are

Page 309. Lib. 3. c. 3. A contradiction in Erastus frequent.

are we to rejoyce in their sinne. But all this hindreth not, but he that is at wrath with his brother, and knowne to be so by the Priests, should be hindred to offer his gift while he be reconciled to him. 8. We are not to hinder acts of externall worship, as praying, praising, preaching; nor can the Church forbid them, except where God by his Commandement require that we do them with a speciall visible qualification and order: As first, be reconciled to your brother, first examine your selfe, and then offer your gift, and come and eat and drinke at the Lords table: and in Negatives, *Come to my Temple, but come not that very day you killed your sonnes to* Molech, *while ye repent and be humbled for that sinne.*

Erastus. *The godly Kings compelled the people to observe the rites ordained of God, at least externally, and* 2 Chron. 15. *killed those that sought not the Lord, then they sinne who punish sinnes by debarring men from the Sacrament: for beside that, they forbid a thing commanded of God, and as it falleth under mens judgement, that is, as it is externall and good, so they cast their sickle in another mans field, because the correcting of sinnes in so farre as they are externall belongeth to the Magistrate, and in so farre as they come from a depraved Will, they belong to God onely.* Page 311.

Ans. Here is one palpable error, that all externall scandals are punished, either by the Magistrate as the Magistrate; so he must be understood, else he saith nothing, or by God onely, contrary to 1 *Cor.*5.11. *Rom.* 16.17. 2 *Thes.*3.14,15. For we give a third, they are punished by the Church, but only in a Ministeriall way. It is false that the godly Kings could compell the unclean Jewes, though circumcised to come to the Temple, or the murtherers of their Children that same day, to come with bloody hands to the Temple: Yet the very locall and personall presence of a Jew in the Temple, and the very posture of his body in looking with his face toward the Temple while he prayed, was an externall lawfull Ordinance of God: They could not then lawfully compell the Jews to these rites, except with such and such previous qualifications; they could not compell the Priests unwashed, and having drunk wine to go to the Sanctuary, 2 *Chro.*15. It is not said, they were to be put to death that should omit any Ceremony, (though every Religious observance be a seeking of God) but they that would not seek God by entring in Covenant to renounce idols, and serve the Lord,

or

or should prove apostates from the sworne Covenant, were to be put to death. 3. If that be a punishment (we contend for things, not for names) which is a privation of good inflicted for a sinne: then let *Erastus* see, if the Priests punish not, who debarred men from the holy things of God (by *Erastus* his grant) for Ceremoniall omissions against a Law of God, And if the Priests should not suffer an unreconciled man to offer gifts, and if the Church should deny pearls to apostates, if this be not punishment? and if the Magistrate be to cast out, or inflict Ecclesiasticall censures, shall he not punish in so doing?

Page 311. 312. 313. What it was to be cast out of the synagogue.

Erastus. *To be cast out of the Synogogue is not to be Excommunicated: For the Synagogue signified sometime all* Iudea, *sometime a particular Congregation, or the place of meeting, or the sermon. By no Law could a circumcised Iew be cast out of all* Iudea, *and sent to the Gentiles, or be compelled to say they were not Iews; Yea, they were killed who denyed Iudaisme.* 2 Maccabees *so the cast out of the Synagogue, were not debarred from the Temple. The Church of the Iews was tyed to one certaine place, but every particular Church hath alike power: To be cast out of the* Synagogue *then with the Iews, must be another thing, then to be Excommunicated now, for he that is cast out of one particular Church, is cast out of the whole Catholick Church. But it was not so in* Iudea, *for Sacrifices and Sacraments (except circumcision and expiation) were only at* Ierusalem, *not in Synagogues: how then could they deny Sacraments, which they wanted themselves? they could not deny what was not in their power to give:* Moses *was read in their Synagogues every Sabbath, No man could be forbidden to heare the Word read, this had been against a manifest precept: It is like they admitted heathens to the Synagogue,* Act. 13.14.c.12.c.18. *But it was not lawfull for heathen to enter into the Temple: And when* Moses *commanded all the clean to go to* Ierusalem, *no Synagogue could forbid them to go.*

Ans. That the Synod might have divers significations, I deny not, but that to be cast out of the Synagogue had divers significations, we deny; Yea, it signified no other thing but to be cast out of the Church, and the Lord Iesus speaketh of it, and the Evangelists as of a standing censure in the Jewish Church, which the spirit of God condemneth no where, except when it was abused, *Ioh.*9. 22. *Ioh.*12.42. *Ioh.*16.2. *Luk.*6.22. *Ioh.*9.35. so is the word נדה *Nadah*,

dah, to Excommunicate as an unclean thing, *Esay* 66.5. *Your Brethren that cast you out. Pagnin* and *Mercer* expound it of casting out of the Synagogue, and they cite *Ioh.9. and* 12. *and* 16. to make it signifie Excommunication. 2. That a circumcised Iew *could by no Law be cast out of* Iudea, seemeth to say, that banishment was not a lawfull punishment: Surely *David* against all Law then did banish *Absolon*, 2 *Sam.*14.13. and when the King of *Persia*, Ezra.7.25,26. commandeth *Ezra* to restore judicatures, as at the beginning; It would seem that banishment was an ancient punishment amongst the Iews: Therefore *Erastus* craftily saith, that no born Iews were so *cast out of* Iudea, *that they were compelled to say they were not* Iews. Surely we never dreamed of such an Excommunication, that the excommunicated should be compelled to lie, and say that though they were Iews and Christians, yet they should say they were not Iews or Christians. 2. When the people was in *Egypt*, 2 *Mac. they were killed who denyed themselves to be* Iews, and deservedly, for they denied their Religion and their God. What is this against Excommunication? We plead not for such an Excommunication, as was a locall extrusion of a person out of the land of I*udea*, nor for such a one wherey they denyed their Nation, that was a sinfull lying. But such, whereby Church priviledges were denyed to some for scandals. 3. Nor do we expound casting out of the Synagogue literally, as *Erastus* doth, to be a casting out of the Synagogue or from the Ordinances there, and from hearing the word or the Law of *Moses*: for the Synagogue is the Church, and it was to be debarred from the Temple, Passeover, and other Holy things, though these should be tyed to one certaine place, to wit, to the Temple; and I doubt, if the excommunicated be to be debarred from hearing the word; 1. Because the excommunicated is to be admonished as a brother, 2 *Thes.*3. 15. and the word preached is a mean simply necessary for the mans gaining. 2. Because heathens were not excluded from hearing the word, 1 *Chron.*14 23. *Act.*17.16.17, 18,19,20.&c. *Act.*14.*v.*15,16,17. But from the Temple and Sacraments they were excluded: We have often answered, that all the Morally unclean, though they were ceremonially clean, are not only not commanded to go up to Ierusalem, that is, to the Temple and holy things, that they are rebuked, and accused, because they stood in the Lords Temple with their bloods and idolatries, and

other abominations in their skirts, *Ieremiah 7. verse 9. 10. Ezekiel* 23. 38, 39. *Esay* 1. *verse* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

Page 313. 314. Erastus. *They call Christ a* Samaritan, Ioh. 8. *Those of* Nazareth *not onely cast him out of the Synagogue, but out of the town, and strove to throw him over the brow of a mountain: Who doubts then but they cast Christ out of the Synagogue, when they made a Law, that if any should confesse him, he should be cast out of the Synagogue: Yet never man objected to Christ, (It is not lawfull to thee to go into the Temple, for thou art cast out of the Synagogue.)* Ergo, *to be cast out of the Synagogue was not to be excommunicated.*

Ans. All these are poor conjectures, for *Erastus* granteth there was such a censure as *casting out of the Synagogue,* But he sheweth not what it is. But I retort this argument; if Christ had been cast out of the Synagogue, those that called him a *Samaritane*, and cast out of their Synagogues, such as confessed him, would have sometime said, (*it is not lawfull to thee to go into the Synagogues and teach, for thou art cast out of the Synagogue.*) But by the contrary, Christ till the day of his death, openly taught in the Synagogues, Ioh. 18. 20. *I spake openly to the world, I ever taught in the Synagogue and in the Temple, whither the Iews alwayes resort,* Luke 4. 15. *he taught in their Synagogues,* Luke 4. 16. *as his custome was, he went into the Synagogues,* Mat. 4. 23. Mark 1. 39. Mark 3. 1. Luk. 6. 6. Mat. 9. 35. Luke 13. 10. and therefore it is a demonstration to me, that they never *cast Christ out of the Synagogue; what hindred them,* saith *Erastus*? I answer. Let him shew me what hindred them to stone him, Ioh. 10. and not to put him to death till his houre came. *Erastus* speaketh not like a divine, who scoffeth at the *secret Counsell of God:* For God had the sufferings of his owne sonne Christ, in a speciall manner, determined and weighed, in number, weight, and measure. And therefore though they made a Law, that all that confesseth Christ *should be cast out of the Synagogue,* and though those that sinned against the Holy Ghost, Matt. 12. called him a *Samaritane*, and out of a sudden passion, those that wondred at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth, would cast him over the brow of a Mountaine; Yet I hold, they never made any Law, nor did

did execute any Law, nor did cast out of their Sgnagogue, or excommunicate the Lord Iesus. I leave *Erastus* to his conjectures.

Erastus. Act. 4. *and* 5. *The Apostles were scourged and cast out by the high Synagogue* summa Synagoga, *yet presently they teach in the Temple, and use the Sacraments*, Act. 21. *When* Paul Act. 21. *was to go to the Temple to sacrifice, the Apostles who counselled him so to do, do not object, that he was excommunicated, and so could not by Law do so; His adversaries accuse him that he taught against the Law, and that he profaned the Temple, by bringing in the Gentiles, he openly saith, he had done nothing against the Law. Then to be cast out of the Synagogue is not to be excommunicated, for one cast out of the Synagogue, could not but do against the Law, if he should go to the Temple and sacrifice.* page 314.

Ans. If *Erastus* would argue logically (as to me in my humble apprehension, he is still weak in all his book in this) we should find frothy grounds: as thus, If those who were scourged and cast out of the Synagogue (to wit, unjustly and against all Law of God for preaching Christ Iesus) were never accused for going into the Temple and using the Sacraments, and say, truly they did nothing against the Law, then the cast out of the Synagogue might lawfully go to the Temple and partake of the Sacraments; the proposition is the greatest untruth that can be. 1. *Erastus* must prove that the Iews accused the Apostles of all and every thing, which they conceived to be against the Law. I conceive this is a conjecture, and false. 2. The other part of the proposition is as false as to say, light is darkness; if *Paul* cast out of the Synagogue, and excommunicated against all Law of God and *Moses*, yet go to the Temple and sacrifice, and partake of Sacraments, say he doth nothing against the Law; then casting out of the Synagogue and Excommunication doth not exclude any from the Temple, sacrifices and Sacraments: this is as much as *Paul* should say, unjust Excommunication against all Law of God and of *Moses* for righteousnesse sake, doth exclude no man from the Temple and the sacrifices and Sacraments; *Ergo*, casting out of the Synagogue and Excommunication rightly administred, doth exclude none from the Temple, sacrifices and Sacraments

The Apostles not cast out of thy Synagogue, that we can read.

ments: Surely it is abominable to ascribe as much to unjustly administred ordinances, as to the just ordinances of Christ. *Erastus* must lay downe the Popish ground of *Navar* and *Gregory*, that Excommunication *sive de justa, sive de injusta causa, either for a just or an unjust cause is to be feared, and hath force.* Might not *Paul* though he had been unjustly excommunicated, go to the Temple and Sacraments, and yet say he had done nothing against the Law? might not the man whom Iesus found after he was unjustly cast out of Temple and Synagogue, *Ioh.9.39.* say, I have done nothing against the Law, nor do against it, though I go to the Temple? 3. How will *Erastus* prove that the Apostles, *Act.4. and* 5. or *Paul* were cast out of the Synagogue or excommunicated? I never could read it: They commanded them neither to preach in Temple or Synagogue any more in the name of Iesus; But that they cast them out of the Synagogue, or cast *Paul* out of the Synagogue, where is it to be read? let *Erastus* teach us.

Navar. in Enchirid. c.27.11.n. 13. Greg. q. 3.c.1.

Page 315. Erastus. *It is hard to say, What it is to be cast out of the Synagogue, it was not Excommunication, it seemeth to be some note of infamy,* Ioh.12. *or a particular banishing them out of a towne, and Iesus seemeth,* Luk.4. *to be banished by the* Nazarites, *and it seemeth to be a denying of right of the City; so as the cast out of the Synagogue shalbe no more esteemed for a true Iew, but as a proselite; Proselites dwelt amongst the Iews, and had right to those same holy things with them, yet were they distinguished from the Iews: so it seemeth to be that which is* Ezra 10. *to be separated from the Crongregation of those that had been carried away captive. It agreeth with that* Deuteronomy 23. *Where the Children of* Edom *were admitted to enter into the Congregation of the Lord in their third generation. Its absurd to thinke that God who is no accepter of Persons, will not have one cut off, a Bastard, an Ammonite, a Moabite received into his Kingdome: So the Lord refused not that they should be circumcised and admitted to the Sacraments; but he would not have them counted for true Iews; He would have Egyptians and* Edomites *received in their third generation: so their Father, Grand-father, and great Grandfather had been circumcised, otherwise to the thousand generation they were not received, and ἀποσυναγωγον ποιεῖν, and ἀποσυνάγωγον γίνεσθ to cast out, or to be cast out of the* Synagogue *are meeker words then to condemne, cast out, excommunicate; and though the Pharisees should debarre*

Page 316.

barre from the Sacraments, thoſe that are caſt out of the Synagogue, We are not to imitate the examples of ill men.

Anſ. 1. If it be hard to determine what it is *to be caſt out of the Synagogue*, it is hard to deny it to be Excommunication; for to be a Member of the Synagogue, as an Elder or a Ruler of the Synagogue, was to be a Member of the Church, and a Church priviledge; *Ergo*, to be caſt out of the Synagogue muſt be to be unchurched, and made no Member of the Church, and this is very like Excommunication: however, *Eraſtus* cannot deny it to bee ſome Church cenſure like to Excommunication as any thing can be. 2. That it was a civill baniſhing out of a Towne, or that Chriſt was baniſhed by the *Nazarites* out of *Nazareth* leaneth upon *Eraſtus* his *ita videtur*, ſo it ſeemeth; To which I crave leave to ſay, *non ita videtur*, it appeareth to be no ſuch thing, Chriſt came againe to *Nazareth*, and till his death was never baniſhed *from Synagogue or Temple*, Iohn 18. 20. They ſhould rather have been ſaid to caſt Chriſt out of the Temple and baniſh him from *Ieruſalem*, for *Ioh.* 10. 22, 23, 31. *They took up ſtones to ſtone him*, v. 39. then to baniſh him out of *Nazareth*, or caſt him out of the Synagogue. 3. *Proſylites* had all the right that Iews had by Gods Law, what men denyed them, is not the queſtion. *Eraſtus* ſpake nothing from Scripture or Gods Law, that was one and the ſame to the born *Iew, and the ſtranger* that came in and was circumciſed, and gave his name to the *Iſrael of God*. 4. To be deprived of the priviledge of a city is a civill puniſhment; *Ergo*, to be caſt out of the Congregation or Synagogue, which was a ſpirituall and Church puniſhment was no ſuch thing. 5. The ſeparating from the Congregation, *Ezra* 10. 8. was Excommunication; the Annotation of the Engliſh Divines ſay it was Excommunication, ſuch as caſting out of the Synagogue, *Ioh.* 9. 22. 6. If it agree with *Deut.* 23. 8. *To enter in the Congregation of the Lord*, is to be a Member of the Church of God, and therefore the Hebrew readeth it, בקהל יהוה into the Church of God. The Chalde Paraphraſt בקהלא דייי *erint mundi ut ingrediantur Eccleſiam Domini, They ſhall be cleane that they may enter into the Church of God.* Sure this was not Phyſicall or civill cleanneſſe, but cleanneſſe ſpirituall according to the Law of God: ſo the ſeventy tranſlate it, εἰσελεύσονται εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου *Hieronym. intrabunt in Eccleſiam Domini.* Vatablus *in Not. erint de conſortio*

Annot. an. 1645. on *Ezra* 10. 8.

Annot. an. 1645. on Deut. 23.1.

tio populi Sancti. The English Annotators cite for this *Nehe.* 13. 1,2. the Law is, that the *Moabite* and the *Ammonite should not enter into the Congregation of the Lord for ever*, It is said v. 3. *They separated from Israel all the mixed multitude*, so that cleare it is, to *enter into the Congregation* is to become a Member of the Church; then *to be separated from the Congregation*, must be to *be cast out of the Church, and deprived of the holy things of God, as heathens and strangers were*, according to that *Levit.* 22.10. *There shall no stranger eate of the holy thing*: What is this but Excommunication? call it with another name, we care not, it is really to be separated from the Church. 7. It is admirable to me to heare *Erastus* say, *It cannot be that God who is no accepter of of persons, will not receive into his Kingdome a Bastard, an Ammonite, a Moabite?* Is not this to reason against the Law of God, and the wisedome of God? *Deut.*23.1,2,3. who saith, that he will not receive such into his Church, which is his Kingdome, and a company of Kings and Priests unto God, which he hath freely loved, *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. *Psal.* 149. 1. *Deut.* 7. 7. *Deut.* 26. 16, 17, 18. as for the rejecting of men from his heavenly Kingdome according to Gods decree of eternall Reprobation, I deny Excommunication to be any such rejection of men; it being onely a casting them out from the visible Church, and the speciall Church priviledges, that their Spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord; and what can be more contrary to the Word, then that *Erastus* should say God declared not, that it *was his will that Moabites, Ammonites should not be circumcised, ana admitted to the Sacraments.* Why then did hee not chuse *Moabites* and *Ammonites* for his people, and make a covenant with them, and give Circumcision a Seale of the Covenant, as he dealt with the Iewes? if he mean God will not exclude *Moabites* and *Ammonites* from the Sacraments, so they repent and turne to him: but now *Erastus* fights with his owne shaddow. Who denieth but Iewes and Gentiles, so they call on him, are welcome to all the holy things of God, and not to be cast out of either Church or Synagogue. 8. To say, to cast out of the Synagogue, is a meeker word then to Excommunicate, is but to beg the question. Yea, but saith *Erastus* it is lesse and a milder thing then to destroy, and *pro deplorato habere*, to esteeme a person lost, we say Excommunication is not to de-

Erastus *ib.* 315. *Non igitur noluit Deus hoc circumcidi, & in Templum atque ad Sacramenta admitti, sed noluit proveris Judæis eos haberi.*

stroy

stroy or to give for lost, but though it be the most violent, yet it is a saving remedy that the man may be ashamed, humbled, and his Spirit saved. 9. We reason not from the fact of *Pharisees*, if they cast any out of the Synagogue for a just cause, they ought also by Gods Law to debarre them from Temple and Sacraments, and therefore if they did not debarre, it was their sinne, not our Rule.

CHAP. XXI. Quest. 17.

Divers other Arguments vindicated, as from Communion with the Church, subjection of Magistrates and Ministers: The Ceremonially unclean from *Matth.* 18. Tell the Church.

ERastus. *Christ hath given a power to his Church to loose,* Ergo, *also to binde: The Church admitteth Believers into Communion*; Ergo, *they cast out the impenitent.* Erastus *Answereth, Such a power as they have to loose and to admit; such and no other have they to binde and to cast out; but it followeth not,* Ergo, *it is a power to debar from the Sacraments, and to Excommunicate: it is* à Genere, *and* Speciem affirmativè. Erastus. l. 6. c. 1. p. 317.

Ans. Erastus is mistaken, and formeth the Argument as he pleaseth. The Church pardoneth as a Church, and receiveth into her body believers to participate of Church-priviledges and Sacraments in a Church-Communion; *Ergo*, the Church hath power to binde and cast out from this same Church-Communion, those that leaveneth the whole lump; as a City may admit a stranger to all the City priviledges; *Ergo*, the same City may for offences against the City, cast out and deprive of City priviledges offenders: is this *a Genere ad speciem affirmativè*? If the Church have a power to cast out ἐκ μέσου from amongst them a Member, we shall not contend for the name of Excommunication.

Page 318. Ministers subject to the Magistrate.

Erastus. *The Ministers have none, by whom in their office they can be corrected: But saith* Erastus, *If every soul be subject to the higher powers, how are Ministers excepted? if Ministers correct Ministers, they*

they play to others hands, spare thou the nails, and I shall spare the teeth.

Ans. The Author doth not except Ministers from civill subjection to Magistrates: But only he saith, In *Ecclesiasticall censures, the Magistrate is not to judge the Ministers*; because a Ministery being an Ecclesiasticall office, as such, it is not liable to the civill power, only the Ministers as they erre and sin in their persons, are liable to civill punishment, but not to Ecclesiasticall, to be inflicted by the Magistrate. 2. Through the corruption of mens nature, every one may wink at anothers faults: It is true, But consider if this flow from the nature of Gods Ordinance, to wit, that the Citizen obey the Laws of the City whereof he is a member. This is an Argument against any Senate, Parliament, Counsell of State, or War, or Aristocracy on earth: if of an hundreth Lords of the States Generall, one or ten play the Traytor to the State, who shall take order with them? Their Collegues and fellow-Senators. Partiall judging falls out here through mens corruption: spare thou the nails, and Ile spare the teeth: and from *Erastus* his way, (if you Argue from mens corruption) the same will follow: May not the Magistrate say to the Minister, *Honour me before the people, and Preach not against the sins of King and Court, and I will oversee and wink at thy Pluralities, non-residencies, soul-murthers?* And may not the Minister say to the Magistrate, *Let me be above all Civill Laws, and be Lord Prelat, and sit on the necks of my Brethren, and defraud, oppresse, and I shall be silent and preach nothing against the idolatry, oppressions, Sodomy, uncleanesse of Magistrate and court.*

P. 318. 319. Erastus. *The Ceremonially unclean were excluded from the Sacraments*; Ergo, *far more the Morally unclean*; *But how* (saith he) *doth this follow? You Excommunicate none but the obstinate*; *for those that were Ceremonially unclean against their will, were excluded from the holy things*; Ergo, *far more he that is Morally unclean is to be debarred, though he be not obstinate: How could* Paul *Excommunicate the incestuous man*, 1 Cor. 5. *he was never admonished*; *or* Peter *Excommunicate* Annanias, *as you say?*

Ans. All Types or comparisons hold only in that for which the spirit of God doth bring them: Now the Ceremonially unclean were

were debarred from holy things, to signifie how much God detests filthinesse. 2. Filthinesse, polluting and leavening others: Now the lesse will in any sin, the lesse sin, and so the lesse contagion to others; and therefore, where there is much infirmity, lesse will, and no contumacy, it rather followeth, *Ergo*, there should be no casting out, no Excommunication.

Erastus. *The Ceremonially unclean were not counted as condemned and lost, as your Excommunicated persons were; they were admitted to Sacraments and the yearly expiation.* Page 318.

Ans. This is Answered fully: The Excommunicated, because Excommunicated, are to us in a way to be saved under Medicine, and not given for lost, no more then those to whom the Pastors do threaten eternall wrath, or those with whom we will not eat, because of their inordinate walking are given for lost, though conditionally they are in danger of damnation if they repent not. 2. It is denyed that the Ceremonially unclean were admitted to the Sacraments. *Philo Judæus*, no lesse well versed in Jewish Antiquities then *Josephus*, *Tract. de sacerdotum honoribus*, saith, *Nulli homicidæ licebat introire Templum*: and *Josephus*, l. 19. c. 7. saith, *Herod Agrippa* who beheaded *James* the brother of Christ, accused one *Simon*, who being a wicked man, went into the Temple, *Quia Templum non nisi puris & dignis pateret*: he witnesseth the same, *De Bel. Judaic.* l. 4. c. 13.

Erastus. *The comparison holdeth not between two sins, which have both of them their own appointed punishment, but when both is punished with one punishment: for it is like this, He that killed any imprudently, was compelled to flee to the City of Refuge, which was a lesse sin*; Ergo, *he that wittingly and wilfully killeth, should rather flye to that City*; *or. a drunken man is to pay a fine*; Ergo, *a bloody Robber is far rather to pay a fine.* P. 319, 320.

Ans. When the comparison is made between a Ceremoniall breach, which is punished with a punishment Ceremonially, or mystically significant; the comparison to a morall sin punished with punishment reall, signified by that Ceremoniall punishment, is inconsequent: But when both sins have the same punishment in the generall, *in genere*, it followeth not, that both should have the same,

in specie, in nature, as a drunkard ought to be punished with stripes; *Ergo*, parricide ought rather to be punished with death; but not *Ergo*, a parricide ought rather to be punished with stripes only: And so the consequence is nought, the leper was punished with being put out of the Camp seven dayes. It followeth not, *Ergo*, he that is defiled with the soul-leprosie of murther, sorcery, should far rather be punished only with being put out of the camp seven dayes: Because there is a higher punishment ordained for morall, then for a Ceremoniall transgression, *Ceteris paribus*.

Page 321. Erastus. *If* Peter *Excommunicated* Ananias, *as you say for a private, far more should Christ have Excommunicated* Iudas *for a more haineus private sin.*

Ans. We say not that *Peter* Excommunicated *Ananias*, but that his killing of him pointed at the punishment of wicked men in the bosome of the Church. 2. Gods punishing of sinners both in the time when, and in the manner, with what kinde of punishment, is no rule to the Churches or Magistrates punishing. If God spare *Ioab* all *Davids* time, it followeth not, *Ergo*, *David* the Magistrate ought also to spare him. If God command to kill the man that gathereth sticks on the Sabbath: it followeth not, *Ergo*, the Church or Magistrate may do the like now, if any should gather sticks on the Sabbath.

Page 321. Erastus. *Let every man try himself, he speaketh of the secrets of Conscience.* Erastus. *That is* (saith he) *false, he speaketh of open sins of Schismaticks, of those that came drunk to the Table, and eat things Sacrificed to Idols.*

Ans. Erastus mistaketh close the Authors meaning, which is to speak of the private and personall self-examination that every Communicant is to enter in before he eat, not of the publike trying, 1 *Cor.* 5. men are to make a secret tryall even of publike sins; so though the sins were publike, yet was the tryall secret and personall, but did not exclude a publike examination by the Church, if need were.

Page 321. Erastus. *Though those that come to the Supper professe Repentance, yet many hypocrites come: So* Isa.1. *those Hypocrites might have said, We testifie by our sacrificing, that we have hands full of blood; If we deal Hypocritically or sincerely, God who knoweth the hearts only must judge, men must judge the best.* Erastus *saith to the place*, Isa.1. *we have*

have Answered before: But (saith he) *if they had said, It is true, our hands are full of blood, but we repent and are sorry, O Prophets, pray to God to have mercy on us, and we shall pray?* They could not be debarred.

Ans. The man that was unreconciled to his brother might say all that at the Altar to the Priest. Yet Christ seeketh some more of him, he will not have him admitted to offer his gift, *but he must leave it there,* and give more then words to both God and the Priest; he must go and humble himself to his offended Brother, and be reconciled to him: And so the Prophet, *Isa.* 1. seeketh more of them, ere he will have them to Sacrifice: *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, cease to do evil, learn to do well*: All this is not done in a moment at the Altar.

Erastus. *Tell the Church, that is, Tell the Magistrate, if he be not a defender of a wicked Religion: For I suppose,* 1. *That Christ speaketh of the Church in* Iudea, *which the Disciples understood where to finde it: Now the Disciples understood so well the Church, that they put no Question to Christ of the matter.* 2. Peter *only saith, How oft shall my Brother offend and I forgive him? Now* Peter *and the Disciples knew nothing of the spirituall Fraternity of the Gentiles before his Resurrection: For they knew only Jews were their Brethren, and they were forbidden to preach to the Gentiles or Samaritans now.* 3. *Let him be to thee as an heathen and a Publican; that is, Let him be as a man most opposite to the Jews: Heathens and Publicans did grievously oppresse them, and made the Roman yoak very burdensome to them.* Page 322.

Ans. 1. *Erastus* doth suppose, (which is most false, as I have Answered before) that Christ speaketh to *Paul* from heaven and *Ananias* also, of bearing the Name of Christ to the Gentiles: and *Paul* neither knew Name nor thing, *Act.* 26. 15, 16, &c. and 9. 15, 16, &c. He speaketh to his Disciples of the promise of the Father, and of the Testimony of the Gospel they were to Preach, *Luk.* 24. 46, 47. &c. which they knew not till afterwards. And what was the use of the holy Ghost to be powred on them? Was not this one of the chief? *Joh.* 14, 26. *He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you:* Then Christ spake many things to them that they bothforgot, & knew not till the holy Ghost came upon them. And their not asking

Though there were no framed Christian Church, yet Christ might say, *Tell the Church.*

Questions will not prove they understood all he spake, sometimes they were afraid to ask him. 2. The *Jewish and Christian Church* have not such essentiall differences, but they knew by the ordinary notion of the word *Church*, a Convention that professed the Doctrine of the Prophets, and of the Law and Gospel. And what such great difference is there between a brother, and a brother Iew and a Brother Gentile, as they behoved to understand the one, and be utterly ignorant of the other? And what necessity to restrict it to Iews only? Christ had often spoken to them of the incoming of the Gentiles, as *Matth.* 8. 11. *Joh.* 10. 16. *Matth.* 10. 18. Did the Disciples know the Kings, Councels, Iudicatures of the Gentiles, that Christ said they should be convented before? *Matth.* 10. 17,18,19 And because *Erastus* is so confident that the word *Church* here is the Civill Magistrate: Let any *Erastian* teach me, what is meant by ἐκκλησία *Church*, Matth. 16. 19. Is it the Civill Magistrate? Is the Civill Magistrate built on a Rock? Shall the Ports of Hell never prevail against the Civill Magistrate? Can no Magistrate make defection from the truth? And doth *Erastus* or his believe in their conscience, that the Disciples understood Christ, *Matth.* 16. (for he spake of both to the Disciples) to speak of the stability and strength, and perseverance of the Christian Magistrate: And that the Ports of Hell should never prevail against the Iewish Sanedrim and Church, which crucified the Lord of glory, and persecuted his Apostles, and all professing the Name of Iesus to the death? 3. Heathen and Publican in generall, were names as opposite to Christian Brethren as to Iewish Brethren, as I have proved before.

P. 323. 324 Erastus. *The word Church to the Hebrews, signifieth either a multitude, or the Senate, or Magistrate, as* Num. 35. *Church is four times,* Josh. 20. *Twice,* Psal. 82. *Once: and it signifies the Magistrate. So we say, the Empire hath done what the Emperour with the States of the Empire hath done. So the Church or Convention think so, because the chief amongst them think so, the Common Wealth hath done this, because the Senate hath done this.*

Ans. The word עֵדָה is *Num.* 35. 12. But in all that Chapter ἐκκλησία is not, but συναγώγη: Now how this signifieth one Magistrate, which ever signifieth a collection or multitude of rulers, I leave

leave to the learned: so *Erast.* faileth yet in his probation. 2. Suppose the word Church signifie the heads of the people, how shall *Erastus* prove that עדה signifieth the senate of Civill Magistrates, for in this Congregation were the *Priests and Levites*, especially, *that judge between blood and blood*, voluntary or *involuntary homicide*, Deut. 17. 12, 13, 14. 2 Chr. 19. 8, 9. It is true also that the man that killed another unwittingly, was to be protected in the City of refuge, *while he should stand before the faces* העדה *of the Congregation*, But let *Erastus*, and all who will have the Bishop or the Pope the representative Church, know that עדה the Congregation, ever, and alwayes be a collective word, as *populus* the *people*, signifieth a multitude, & never by Grammer, one single man, *hoc nomen* (saith *Pagnine*) *certum conventum, sive cetum significat, certum Collegium*, it alwayes signifieth a societie: as *the Princes of the Congregation* Num. 16. 2. *all the Princes* בעדה *in the Congregation*, Exo. 34. 31. here is a number and a societie, τὸ πᾶν saith *Aristotle* can be atributed to no fewer then to three at least. Speak to all the Congregation of *Israel* אל־כל־עדה *Exodus* 12. 3. and the *Congregations of peoples* ועדה לאמים *shall compasse thee about*, Psal. 7. 8. *Nor shall sinners stand* בעדה *in the Congregation of the just*, Psal. 1. 5. *Thou hast made desolate all my Congregation*, Iob. 16, 7. 2. The word is from a root that signifieth to conveene and gather together יעד Therefore *Iud.* 14. 8. a swarme or a Congregation of Bees, is called עדה a Congregation. And that the word ἐκκλησία Church since the world began, never signified one single man, either *King, Magistrate, Pope, or Prelate*, But alwayes a multitude either of rulers or people, I appeal to *Demosthenes, Homer, Phocillides, Hesiod, Lucian, Pluto, Aristotle*, to *Suidas, Stephanus, Scapula*; or for the word, *Cetus, Congregatio*, to all Latine Authors, to the seventy interpreters in the Old Testament, to *Hyeronimus*, all the Greek Fathers, and to the Evangelists and Apostles in the New Testament, to *Act.* 19. 32. *Eph.* 5. 23. *Act.* 8. 13. *Rom.* 16. 5. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. *Gal.* 1. 2. 1 *Thes.* 1. 1. 2 *Thess.* 1. 1. *Act.* 15. 3, 4, 22. *Act.* 16. 5. *Act.* 14. 23. *Rev.* 1. 20. *Rev.* 2. 1. and for *Psal.* 82. עדה there is a Congregation of Gods or Magistrates, and *v.* 6. *All of you are Children of the most high*, he speaketh evidently of a multitude of Iudges. 3. Suppose the Empire be said to do what the *Senate, Parliament, or great Councell* of the Empire or Kingdome doth: This will not prove that the word Church

Pagninus, Merc. in Thesaur. p. 994.

in

in either of the Originall Tongues Hebrew or Greek, doth signifie one man, so as *Tell the Church*, must be all one with, *Tell one single Magistrate, or, Tell one Prelate or one Pope*, and he that will not hear the Magistrate, that is, the King, or one single Magistrate alone, without any fellow Magistrates, he being a Christian, is to be dealt with as an heathen, and a publican, and not as a Christian brother: For what the King doth alone without his Senate, is never called the deed of the Senate, farre lesse the act or deed of the whole Ecclesia, of the Kingdome, produce any shaddow of Grammer for this: Now to *Erastus, Tell the Church, is all one with, Tell the single Christian Magistrate alone separated from Fellow-judges, or Councell, Senate, Parliament, Ecclesiasticall Assemblies, and if he hear not and obey not this one single Christian Magistrate, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican:* For *Erastus* will have the Civill Magistrate, though the whole Church and Pastors should judge the contrary, to have power by vertue of his office to determine against Pastors and Elders: Yea, by his office he is to command them to preach, and synodically to determine this and this, and what they determine they do, *à et sub Magistratu, under, and from this one single Magistrate as his servants, instruments, Vicars and deputies*, and therefore the Magistrate cannot sentence in the name of Pastors, Elders, when they are but his servants: And, 2. When he may by his office, do contrary to what they judge in conscience ought to be done: So *Tell the Church, to* Erastus *is, Tell the one individuall single Magistrate, who by office may judge without, and contrary to the advice of all the Church Pastors, Doctors, Elders, yea, people and all:* Now though we grant, that what the Emperour doth as Emperour, and the Magistrate as Magistrate hath done, that the Empire, City, and Incorporation doth, (which yet is never true in the Church, which hath no King as a Church, save onely the head and King Iesus Christ) yet *Erastus* hath not proved, what the Emperour doth without, and contrary to the advice of all the Empire, that the Empire hath done that.

Erastus. *Christ either understandeth by the Church the Whole multitude of Ierusalem, or then the Magistrates: But he understandeth not the multitude,* 1. *Because Christ would not change the Government of heathens, farre lesse of that which his Father had appointed in* Judea, *in which the people did never Governe: Yea, the Apostles to their*

Page 324. 325.

their death did nothing against Moses *his Law, and how they take Christ to speak of a Church to be founded of new after his resurrection who beleeved not he should die and rise againe; and after his resurrection knew not what a kingdome, whether worldly, or spirituall, he was to have, cannot be conceived.*

Ans. 1. Many will deny the Major, for he understood the rulers of the Christian Church, not excluding the consent of the Christian Church of beleevers in the matter of Excommunication. 2. I deny that Christ doth here re-establish a Synedry, and bid them *Tell the Scribes and Pharisees*, and those that were to crucifie himselfe, and to persecute the Apostles to the death. Christ knew those to be miserable healers of scandals betweene brother and brother. 2. He knew this Sanedrim to be the Disciples of Christs capitall enemies, he warned the Disciples to beware of the leaven of their corrupt Doctrine, he prophecied this Sanedrim should be destroyed as a degenerated *plant, that his heavenly father had not planted*, and was it like Christ would direct them a perishing and degenerate remedie against scandals, that he would have removed by his Church, even till the end of the world? 2. It is most false, that the Apostles did keep to death the institutions and ordinances of *Moses*, Act. 15. They abrogated all the ceremoniall Law, except that of blood and things strangled, and *Paul* said, he that would amongst the *Galathians be circumcised, was falne from Christ*, see *Col.* 2. *Gal.* 4. *Heb.* 13. and elsewhere the contrary. The Government was now to expire with Christs death and ascension, in so farre as it was pedagogicall. 3. Christ spake often of his Kingdome to them, and they understood nothing but an earthly and temporall Kingdome; and that they understood perfectly: All this time the Church of *Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, beleevers in Christ*, is denied; Let *Erastus* answer, when Christ said *Mat.* 16. *He would build his Church on a rock unpregnable and insuperable to hell*: If the Apostles understood a *Church* to be founded after the resurrection, and when Christ said, *Loe I am with you to the end of the world*, if Christ meant not he would give his presence to the Christian Church, not then founded, for even after his resurrection they dreamed of an earthly Kingdome, *Act.* 1. and that our divines do rightly expound that place, *I am with you, All the faithfull Pastors, Doctors, Church-officers and beleevers to the Lords second appearance, is clear.*

Erastus.

Page 326. Erastus. *Christ bade, Tell that Church which hath power to conveene the offender before it, examine Witnesses judicially,* cognosce *and give sentence, but in Christs time the multitude could not doe this.*

There was no more a right constituted Sanedrim in Christs time, then a Christian Church.

Ans. Ergo, the Church hath a spirituall judicature: This is for us. 2. Nor had the *Sanedrim* the power in all offences, as *Erastus* would make the world beleeve, for it was but a shadow at this time void of power, and used what power they had against Christ and the Gospel. Nor needeth *Erastus* to prove that by the Church the multitude cannot be understood; though he cannot exclude them from their owne part in Church Government, both in consenting, and in withdrawing from the Excommunicated.

Page 327. Erastus. *But, Tell the Church is all one with this, Appoint some who in the name of the Church may mannage the businesse; but how prove they this? Then Christ bade, Tell the Elders that then were, else he did not accommodate himselfe to their understanding to whom he spake; when he was to teach how our sacrifices pleaseth God, he biddeth us first be reconciled to our brother, and then sacrifice, yet he knew that sacrifices were to be abolished, but by Analogie he would teach us, what he requireth when he saith, he will have mercy, and not sacrifice;* Ergo, *by your own confession to tell the Church is to tell the Sanedrim, for there was then no Church but the multitude.*

Ans. 1. (*Tell the Church*) cannot in any sense, have such a meaning, as *Appoint Elders and tell them*; for then (*Tell the Sanedrim*) must have this meaning, set up a sound Sanedrim, according as *Moses* appointed, and *tell the Sanedrim.* The *Sanedrim* in its right constitution and due power as the Law of *Moses* required it, was not to be had at this time: *Herod* had killed the *Sanedrim*, the *Romans* made High Priests from yeere to yeere against the institution, the power of life and death in the civill *Sanedrim* was now none at all. The Scepter was departed from *Judah*, those that sate in *Moses Chaire* corrupted all, so the right *Sanedrim* was no more now to be had, then a Christian Church not yet erected. Again, *Tell the Church*, presupposeth a constituted Church, and therefore cannot include a command to erect a new mould.

2. Tell

2. *Tell the Elders* of the Christian Church, may as well be meant in these words, *Tell the Church*, as the Iewish Church can be understood. 3. The word *Church*, and to *conveene offenders, hear Witnesses, give out sentence*, were all plaine Language to the disciples, though they knew not the frame of the Gospell Church, as yet, Christ being now teaching an ordinance of a Church, and the censure of Excommunication that was not to fall under practise, while Christ should ascend to heaven; and therefore though this Church was not, yet it followeth not, that the Lord Iesus speaketh of the *Sanedrim*.. 4. Say that he meane the *Sanedrim*; *Ergo*, say we, he speaketh nothing of the Christian Magistrate. 1. Because there was no Magistrate now, but Iewish Magistrates as *Erastus* cannot deny. 2. Because this *Sanedrim* that gained soules of offending brethren, was Ecclesiasticall, not civill. 3. By proportion, and Analogie Christ must understand the *Church* of Christians, though the *Sanedrim* was to be removed shortly.

Erastus. *It is a great controversie, who are to be chosen out of the bodie of the Church to excommunicate judicially.* Page 328.

Ans. The controversie was moved partly by *Erastus*, partly by *Morellius*, not in the reformed Churches.

Erastus. *Some say the Magistrate should chuse the Elders at least at the first, even though the Church doe not consent. But how can they sit in place of the Church and judge, who were against the will and minde of the Church chosen to be Iudges? for though the Magistrate be a chiefe Member of the Church, yet to Tell the Church, is not to Tell the Magistrate* (as you say) *but to Tell the whole Church, and it is no excuse that the Magistrate doth but once chuse the Elders, for if hee have no right nor Law from God to doe it, he can never doe it, and if he have Law from God to doe it, he ought alwayes to doe it.* page 329.

Ans. Here *Erastus* reasoneth against some Author that inclineth to the way of *Morellius*.

If there bee no formed Church endued with knowledge and discretion to chuse their owne Elders, if there be godly men fit to be chosen, they are to convene and chuse from amongst them

Elders, the godly Magistrate is to joyne his Vote and Power, because there is a Church not yet constitute, it is now *Perturbatus aut corruptus Ecclesiæ status*, and I ever judged it a golden saying of that great Divine *Fran. Iunius*, that *When the Magistrate will not concurre, the Church in that extraordinary case may doe somewhat, which ordinarily they cannot doe; and againe When the Church doth not their duty, the Magistrate in that case may doe something more then ordinary, to cause the Church doe their dutie; for its a common Law, to ills out of order, remedies out of the road way may be applyed.* So if the Priests and Levites be corrupt, *Iehoshaphat* and *Hezekiah* and *Iosiah* may reforme: And therefore though the godly Magistrate, *jure communi*, by the common Law of Nature, imploy his power to appoint Elders, all Errors and confusions in the Church are in some measure out of order; yet it followeth, that *jure proprio*, and ordinarily he should alwayes doe this. 2. Elders are not properly Representators of the Church to me, while I be better informed, for power of feeding and ruling is immediately given by *Iesus Christ* to the Elders, and not by the interveening mediation of the Church, but onely by their designation to the office; this power is given by the people. 3. The Magistrate as the Magistrate, and by vertue of his place, is neither a Member, farre lesse a chiefe Member of the Church, for then all Magistrates should be Members of the Church, even Heathen Kings and Rulers, which no man can say. The Christian Magistrate as a Christian is a Member of the Church. But that is nothing to helpe *Erastus*.

Iunius animad. in Bellar. de concil. l. 1. c. 12. Not. 18. deficiente conjunctione Magistratus, potest aliquid Ecclesia extra ordinem facere, quod ordinario non potest, & contra deficiente Ecclesiâ à suo officio, potest Magistratus extra ordinem procurare ut Ecclesia ad officium redeat, id enim juris communis est, extraordinariis malis remedia etiam extra ordinem adhiberi posse. Page 329, 330.

Erastus. *Because the multitude can doe nothing in order, therefore (say they) they have power to choose Elders to whom belongeth the power of Excommunication. But how prove they this? Though a company wanting a Magistrate have this power, shall it follow, that a company to whom God hath given a godly Magistrate should have this power? But because confusion would follow, therefore Elders are to be chosen*; Ergo, *Such Elders as make up your Presbyterie*, à genere ad speciem affirmativè nulla est consequutio.

Ans.

Anſ. 1. Not only from neceſſity of eſchewing confuſion, but from the poſitive Ordinance of God, we infer Presbyters; we do not own any ſuch conſequence: Prelates and Papiſts argue for a Monarchy in the Church, from order: we know no creatures of the like frame: *Eraſtus* is for a Biſhop, he may ſo argue, not we: We finde *Chriſt* hath placed ſuch organs in his body, as *Eph.* 4. 11. 12. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. 1 *Tim.* 3. 1,2, *&c Act.* 6. 1,2, *&c. and* 14. 23. Ergo, they ought to be, for we think the Church cannot govern it ſelf. 2. If the Church wanting a Magiſtrate as the Apoſtolick Church did, have power to chuſe Presbyters, and by a Divine Law: how dare *Eraſtus* ſay, That *it followeth not, When the Church hath a godly Magiſtrate, ſhe ſhould keep the ſame power?* Can the godly Magiſtrate when he cometh into the *Church*, take any Divine power from the *Church*? Is the Magiſtrate given to the Church as a Nurſe-father to preſerve that power that *Chriſt* hath given to his Spouſe? or is he given as a ſpoiler at noon-day, to take to himſelf the power, and make the Ambaſſadors of Chriſt, his Ambaſſadors and Servants to preach in his Name; whereas before when they had no Magiſtrate, Paſtors did preach only in the Name of Ieſus Chriſt?

Eraſtus. *Sure the Lord hath concredited to the Magiſtrate, the Command and all power of externall Government, ſo as he hath ſubjected not only Civill, but alſo Sacred things to his power, that he may manage the one according to the Word of God, the other according to Juſtice and equity, which ſince it is Commanded in the Old Teſtament, and practiſed by all holy Judges and Kings, and we finde it not changed in the New Teſtament; We juſtly ſay that the Church that hath a godly Magiſtrate, cannot by Gods Will chuſe a new Senate or Presbytery, to exerciſe publikely Judgement; for God hath not armed ſubjects againſt their Magiſtrates: Nor hath he Commanded them to take any part of their power from them and give it to others, and to ſubject them to externall Dominion.* Page 33.

Anſ. Sure the Lord concredited to the Prieſt, not to King *Vzziah* to burn incenſe, and to the Prieſts to rebuke *Vzziah* and command him to deſiſt; and this is no leſſe externall Governing of the houſe of God, *quoad hoc*, in this particular then Excommunication: for to Excommunication on the Churches part, as Excommunication, is no more required, but that the ſcandalous and murthering Ma-

gistrate should not come to the Table of the Lord, or remain in the society and Church-fellowship of the Saints as a Member of the Church. Now if the Magistrate obey not, the Church as the Church can use no bodily coaction or restraint to hinder the Magistrate to obtrude himself upon the holy things of God: though other, either fellow-Magistrates, or the inferior Magistrates, (if the party excommunicated be the supream Magistrate) or, the Parliament may and ought to use their power as Magistrates, by the sword to hinder the holy things of God to be prophaned; for I think it easie to prove, if this were a fit place, that inferior Magistrates are essentially Magistrates, and immediatly subject to the King of Kings for the due use of the sword, as the supream Magistrate or King: And therefore there is no more externall dominion used in Excommunicating a bloody and scandalous Magistrate, then in rebuking and threatning him: Now *Erastus* granteth, *That Pastors may rebuke and threaten according to the Word of the Lord, even Magistrates and Kings.* 2. If because Iudges in the Old Testament, as *Eli* and *Samuel* Sacrificed, and we finde this not changed in the New, and nothing extraordinary in this, Ministers in the New Testament may do the same: Then the Iustice of Peace, and Mayors of Cities, and every constable, may by vertue of their office Preach the Word and dispense the Sacraments, which is against the word, *Heb.* 5.7. *Mat.* 9 38. & 10.5. & 28.19,20. *Joh.* 21.20,21. *Rom.* 10.14, 15. 3. Where doth *Erastus* reade in the New Testament, that Kings may not write Canonick Scripture, as King *David* did, and build a Typicall Temple to the Lord as *Solomon* did, and give out Laws of Divine institution as *Moses* did? Kings in the Old Testament did these, and he can finde the contrary no where written. 4. If the *Church* as the *Church* cannot chuse a Senate of Elders to Govern themselves without wronging the Magistrate; how did the Apostolick Church without so much as asking advice of the Civill Magistrate, set up a new Gospel, new Sacraments, new officers, a new Government: Did the Lord Iesus and the Gospel teach them to spoil *Cesar*? *Christ* had said the contrary, *Give unto Cesar those things that are Cesars.* 5. To subject Magistrates to Excommunication, is no more to *subject them to externall dominion*, then to subject them (as *Erastus* doth) to rebukes, warnings and threatnings; for the former hath no more of coaction, of dominion, or of coercive power,

Rebuking of Princes argue no lesse jurisdiction, then all that the Presbytery doth.

power, then the latter: yea, if to subject Kings to the rebukes of the *Ministers of Christ*, be nothing but to subject them to internall and spirituall dominion; no more is suspension from the Sacraments and Excommunication, any thing but *internall and spirituall dominion.* In this sense, that neither of these two are bodily dominions, no more then rebuking of Kings. 2. Yet both these work upon the conscience in a spirituall way, for the humiliation of the King, and putting him to *shame and fear*, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14,15. *that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord*, as rebukes do work, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. *Gal.* 2. 11. 1 *Cor.* 5. 6. *Iude* ver. 23. Yea, to say to a King, *He shall be buried with the buriall of an Asse*, as *Ieremiah* did, cap. 22. And to call the Rulers, *Princes of Sodome*, Isa. 1. 10. And *King Herod a Fox*, and Rulers and Princes *Dogs*, Psal. 22. ver. 16. and *Bulls and Lyons*, ver. 12. 13. and *Wolves ravening for the prey*, Ezek. 22. 27. putteth no lesse shame upon Magistrates before men, and so externall dominion on them and over them, then Excommunication and debarring from the Seals of the Covenant doth. Now *Erastus* subjecteth Magistrates to rebukings, threatnings and reprehensions no lesse then we do. Well, *Erastus* will have one single Minister to exercise externall dominion over the Magistrates, because this is manifest out of the Word: but because he would flatter Princes as much as he can, he denies that a Colledge of Elders may rebuke the Magistrate, or convene him before them, though he were the most flagitious Prince that lived; and yet one man may summon him before the Tribunall of Christ, and charge him to come to hear a Sermon, and rebuke him in the face of the Congregation, and denounce the Iudgements of God against him openly. Is not this the Lord arming one single man against the Magistrate, to put shame and confusion on him for his sins? And if many Pastors convened should do this, This were to *arm the subjects against the Magistrate, and to take the power from him that God hath given to him*, as *Erastus* talketh.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII. Quest. 18.

Of exclusion from the Sacrament, of profession of repententance, the judiciall Law bindeth not Christians. The sword not a mean, of conversion. Of Idolaters and Apostates in the judgement of Erastus.

Erastus l. 6. c. 2. p. 331. 332.

IN this Chapter *Erastus* disputeth against a Treatise written in the *German* Tongue, in which he acknowledgeth, there is more learning and truth then in the other writtings. All the opinions that *Erastus* ascribeth to this Author, (justly or unjustly, I know not, but *Erastus* his faith may be justly suspected) I cannot defend.

Erastus. *Touching those to be admitted to the Sacrament, we speak alwayes,* de illis solis, *&c. of those only Who rightly understand the Doctrine of the Gospel, and do approve and imbrace the same, and Who desire With others to use the Sacraments aright, in regard of the externals, of Which only the Church can judge, for the heart is rightly knowne to God only; so the Author and We agree.*

Ans. The agreement is but poore by your owne relation: But 1. Let *Erastus* answer, what if the Christian Magistrate as *Achab* be a dog, and *sell himselfe to do wickedly:* What if he understand not the Doctrine of the Gospel? Magistrates as Magistrates by vertue of the throne, or place, are not priviledged to be Orthodox and holy. Let one *Iulian* once a Christian, yet turning a sow, an enemy to the Gospel be witnesse, if we descend to the Iustices, and to Master Constables; it may be we finde even of those dogs and swine in their conversation, though their place be a power, lawfull, and ordained of God; We thinke (saith *Erastus*) *the custome of the Church should be observed:* What? by the custome of the Church onely, by no precept or command of Christ should the holy things of God, the pearls of the Gospel be denied to dogs and swine contrary to Christs command, *Mat.* 7? 2. *Erastus* must exclude the Magistrate out of the lists of his disputation in six books, and say, If *the Christian Magistrate be ignorant and scandalous, and yet desire to use the Sacraments right, and professe he will learne to know God, and*

to

to beleeve soundly, and walke holily, Yet the Sacraments are not to be denied to him. Tell *Erastus*, in sincerity who should debarre the Magistrate? For in all your six books, you by these words, *de illis solis*, &c. professe that you plead not that he should be admitted to the Sacraments; who shall exclude him? not he himselfe; for his credites sake he shall desire to come to the Sacraments, as many for gaine and loaves follow Christ, *Ioh.6.* will they not follow him also to be seen of men, as the Pharisees prayed in the streets? 2. Let *Erastus* say, when our Saviour said, *Give not holy things to dogs*? Did he mean to accept the persons of Kings and Iudges, and professe, though Kings and Iudges be dogs and swine; yet deny not holy things to them? 3. Hath Christ appointed no way in the New Testament, as he did in the Old, to debarre unclean men from our Passeover? Or shall there be no Government, no charge in the Ministers of the New Testament to keep the holy things of God from pollution? If Master Iustice be an incestuous man, a drunkard, a dog, shall he not be cast out of the midst of the Church? *Uzziah* though a King, yet for bodily leprosie was separated from the people of God, and men of high places, though doggs and swine shall be admitted to all the holy things of God under the New Testament?

Magistrates if scandalous are to be debarred from the Sacrament.

2. Erastus *Will have all admitted who desire to use the Sacraments right; As touching all externalls, of which onely the Church doth judge*: But, 1. Where did we assert that the Church judgeth of internalls? and that they may debarre men from the Sacraments, for only heart-unbeleefe knowne to God only? This must lye on *Erastus*, as a calumnie, while he make it good from our writings and Doctrine, that we thus teach, exclude those that are visibly scandalous and prophane, and we are satisfied. 2. He that brings his offering to the Altar, and hath done a knowne offence to his brother, (for it is a sinfull and visible scandall, which scandalizeth one brother) *He useth not the holy things of God right, even as touching externals*; He that comes to the Lords supper desiring, and asking the *ordinance of righteousnesse* (as *Isaiah* speaketh) and promiseth amendment; and yet is openly ignorant and not sound in the faith, he useth not aright the Sacraments even in externals, of which only the Church judgeth rightly: as he that in the same day commeth to the temple to worship (now the very personall presence of

a Iew

a Iew in the Temple which was a Type of Iesus Christ, was a worship and a holy thing of God, whereas our presence in the place of meeting for worship is no such thing) when he hath killed his sonne to *Molech*, prophaned the Temple, and the name of God, even in externals; for the Priests of old who were to put *difference between the clean and the unclean*, no more were to judge the inward thoughts and heart-dispositions of men knowne to God only, then we can now judge them in the New Testament, 1 *Chro.* 29. 17. 1 *King.* 8. 39. 1 *Chro.* 28. 9. *Prov.* 15. 11. Hence, that is an ignorant speach of *Erastus*, *Qui statuit malus esse, non prodibit in ecclesiæ faciem, ut se pœnitere prioris vitæ testetur, ac meliorem promittat. That man shall never come before the face of the Church, to testifie that he repenteth of his former wicked life, and promise amendment, who purposeth to be wicked*: Will not men purpose not to be reconciled to their brethren, and suffer many suns to go downe in their wrath and malice, who come and bring their offring to the Altar; why did then Christ forbid offring at the Altar, without being reconciled to an offended brother? *Mat.* 5. might not the offending brother offer his gift? and were not the Priests to except his offring? He could say all that *Erastus* requireth: I *acknowledge* I *have offended my brother*, I *promise to crave him pardon*, *and* I *desire to offer according to the Law.* Then the Priest was obliged to beleeve he dealt sincerely, and lay his gift upon the Altar, though he should not obey the command of Christ, *and go and leave his gift at the Altar*, and not offer while he were first reconciled to his brother; and the like I say of one that hath killed his brother, and cometh with hot blood to the Table of the Lord, and goeth not to the Widdow and Orphanes, whose Husband and Father he had killed, to be reconciled: Surely the man that should thus offer, should not come to offer, nor to eat at the Lords table rightly; even in regard of externals, which the Church may judge: for he should omit this externall, *Be first reconciled to the Widdow*, and then offer, and eat, as Christ commanded. 3. It is against Scripture and experience, that a man that hath a purpose to kill his Father, and in the highest point of treason to invade King *Davids* throne, as *Absolon* did, to say he will not professe to pay his vows at *Hebron.* And might not *Judas* by his very eating the Passeover, professe he beleeved in the Lambe of God that taketh away the sins of the world, and that he would

P. 331. 332

would ſerve Chriſt, and yet purpoſe in his heart to ſell his Maſter Chriſt for 30. peeces of ſilver; They ſeeme to be little acquainted with the myſterie of the hypocriſie naturally in men, who put in print ſuch a poſition: The Author againſt whom *Eraſtus* writeth ſaith, *We have reaſon to rejoyce, if we finde any ſuch,* who will not profeſſe faith and repentance, though they be Hypocrites; and therefore there is need of Excommnnication, and his meaning is, that there is need of Excommunication alwayes, and therefore there will be many who profeſſe Repentance in words, whoſe life and converſation belie their Repentance; and *Eraſtus* cannot deny this, if he know what it is to have *a forme of godlineſſe, and deny the power,* which forme many have who are to be debarred from the Sacraments, and to be Excommunicated, in regard they are *lovers of their owne ſelves, covetous, boaſters, proud, blaſphemers, diſobedient to parents, unthankfull, without naturall affection, truce breakers, falſe accuſers, incontinent, fierce, deſpiſers of thoſe that are good, traitors, headie, high minded,* &c. 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2, &c. and ſuch they are in the eies of men, otherwiſe *Paul* would not forbid to withdraw from ſuch.

Eraſtus. *The Author I thinke would yeeld that the Sacraments ſhould not be denyed to thoſe who ſeeke them, and deſire to uſe them aright, and are not excommunicated; for he writeth that the deniall of the Sacraments, is onely a Teſtimony of excommunication; So when we give not a Teſtimony of a thing for example of learning, to any to whom the thing it ſelfe, to wit, learning doth not agree, we cannot deny the Sacraments to thoſe who are not Excommunicated, for hee ſhould not be blotted with a Teſtimony of a baniſhed man, who is not declared to be baniſhed.* Page 332.

Anſ. 1. The Author I thinke would never yeeld, but the Sacraments ought to be denied to thoſe who aske for them, and deſire to uſe them aright, if they be otherwiſe *Truce-breakers, falſe accuſers, incontinent, traitors,* for thoſe have, and may have *a forme of godlines,* and aske the Sacraments and deſire to uſe them aright; I meane they may ſay they deſire to uſe them aright, *for of their inward deſire, God onely can judge, who knoweth the heart;* yet the

Author cannot, he will not say, that such are to be admitted to the Lords Supper, all that *Erastus* goeth on is, That the Church is obliged to beleeve that those doe repent, and use the Sacraments aright, who say in word of mouth, they doe so, and therefore are to be admitted to the Sacraments, though they come but an houre before out of the Bordell-house, and have hands and sword hot and smoking with innocent blood. Now Dogs, and Swine, *Cain*, *Iudas*, known to be scandalous, may give faire words, and *cry, Lord, Lord, and professe all this*, as is cleare, *Isa.* 58. 2. *Mat.* 7. 21, 22. *Rom.* 16. 18. *Mat.* 23. 13, 14, 23, &c. 2. Exclusion from the Sacraments is a Testimony of Excommunication, but not *testimonium proprium quarto modo*, for some that are not excommunicated, are to be debarred from the Sacraments as the thing it selfe will force us to acknowledge; should any come with his sword hot in blood, from killing his father and Pastor to the Lords Table, I hope the Church knowing this would not admit him to the Sacrament, and yet he is not yet excommunicated, and I hope they would not presently in the same moment that they debarred him from the Lords Supper, excommunicate him. There must be some time required to pray for him, to rebuke, convince, and lay open his sinne before he be excommunicated, which moved me to thinke that there was necessity of expresse Scripture to prove Excommunication; but that abstention (as Divines calleth it) or suspension from the Lords Supper, may well be sufficiently proved by Analogie, by consequent and by the nature of the holy things of God, and Pearles that are not to be given to the prophane. 3. A visible scandall is a sufficient ground of the lesser excommunication, or debarring from the Lords Supper, and so we put a Testimony of one banished from the holy things of God on him who hath committed a scandalous offence, which is a sufficient ground thereof, though the offender be not formally excommunicated. This Author saith, *without the consent of the Church, no man, though contumacious, should be excommunicated*; What this is against us, or for *Erastus*, I see not, we say the same.

He saith, The Magistrate may chuse some of the congregation to Excommunicate; which if he say, I consent not to him, and see no warrant for it in Scripture: But I rather believe his sense to be, That the godly Magistrate may command the Church to Excommu-

nicate

nicate and punish them, if they be negligent in this. But hence it followeth not, that the Magistrate may Excommunicate them, as *Erastus* inferreth, no more then of old; it followeth, King *Vzziah* might command the Priests to burn incense to the Lord, and punish them; if in this they should neglect their duty: *Ergo*, King *Vzziah* might lawfully in his own person burn incense to the Lord: *Erastus* himself will deny this consequence.

Erastus saith, It is evident this Author meaneth, *That God commanded not a Presbytery to be, but that it is necessary for orders cause.* Page 334. But I had rather that he had proved it from the Authors words: And so I deny it, while *Erastus* bring his own words to prove it: I believe he fancies many things of this worthy Author, as that he subjects not the Magistrate to the Presbytery: And why? Because he saith, *None ought to be Excommunicated without the consent of the Magistrate.* Truly it is a weak reason; for if the Magistrate be a godly man, and a Member of the Church, it is necessary that his positive consent be had, that he may in light and faith use the sword against him, as against other evil doers. But I give him no negative voyce, nor any authoritative or Ecclesiastically judiciall voyce in Excommunication, which can be due to him as a Magistrate: So the Author doth not at all disagree from us; *Erastus* is mistaken.

Erastus. *God hath Excommunicated Drunkards, Hypocrites from the Sacraments except they repent: But where hath God commanded such, being Circumcised and Baptized to be excluded from the Sacraments? especially if they professe that they repent of their former wayes: for it is one thing to be excluded of God, another thing to be cast out of the visible society of the godly.* Page 335.

Ans. God hath Excommunicated Drunkards and Hypocrites, who are not known openly to be such to the Church, and therefore the Church cannot debar such from the Sacraments, and so we grant all, *That it is one thing to be* Excommunicated *of the Church, and another to be Excommunicated of God.* 2. He asketh, where hath God commanded *to debar such from the Sacraments being circumcised and baptized?* I Answer then, If they be uncircumcised and unbaptised, God will have the Church to debar them. But let *Erastus* shew any Scripture for their exclusion, but such as warrant-

eth us to exclude the openly ſcandalous, though circumciſed and baptized. 3. What warrant hath the Church or Magiſtrate, if *Eraſtus* ſo will, to debar all the uncircumciſed and unbaptiſed from the Sacraments; *Job*, the *Eunuch*, are not Excommunicated of God: *Ergo*, if the Lords non-Excommunication be our rule, we cannot Excommunicate all the uncircumciſed and baptized as ſuch. 4. *Eraſtus* addeth, They cannot be excluded from the Sacraments, *Preſertim ſi pœnitentiam vitæ anteactæ præ ſe ferant, eſpecially if they profeſſe repentance.* But this *preſertim, eſpecially*, ſeemeth to infer, though they profeſſe no repentance, but be dogs and ſwine, they ought not to be debarred from the Seals. Is this piety, or rather prophanity? But only he would ſay, they are far leſſe to be debarred if they profeſſe repentance. But we know, to profeſſe repentance in *Eraſtus* his way, is to ſay by word of mouth, they repent: Now this ſaying ſo, may conſiſt with being openly dogs and ſwine. Hence we ſee the contradicent of *Eraſtus* his ſaying, to wit, that the moſt openly ſcandalous are not to be excluded from the Sacraments, eſpecially if they ſay they repent, that is, eſpecially if they lye and diſſemble before the Sun, yea, though they mock God and repent not. I ſhould think their ſaying they repent, when their flagitious and impure converſation doth belye their profeſſion, maketh them ſo much rather worthy to be debarred, being both dogs and Hypocrites: So far I am from *Eraſtus* his *preſertim, eſpecially if they profeſſe that they repent.*

Every profeſſion maketh not men capable of the holy things of God.

Page 335. 336. Eraſtus. *I grant it fighteth with Gods will, that pardon ſhould be denied to any by the Word, and yet pardon ſealed to thoſe ſame men in the Sacrament: But when the Word denyeth remiſſion of ſins abſolutely to thoſe, the Sacraments are not due to them; but the Word denieth not remiſſion to them upon condition they repent, and ſo neither ſhould the Sacraments be denied to them.*

Anſ. But the word denyeth abſolutely remiſſion of ſins to dogs and ſwine, ſo long as they repent not; and that ſo much the more, that they ſay they repent, and their life belies their words, and teſtifies to their face, and before the Sun, that they are plaiſtered Hypocrites, *Ergo*, the Sacraments ſhould be denyed to them.

Pags 336. Eraſtus. *But it followeth not that the Sacraments belongeth not to him*

him who is not a member of the inviſible Church, ſo he be a member of the viſible Church; but as he partaketh only of the externall Communion, ſo he receiveth but the externall elements, from an externall Miniſter.

Anſ. But if he be viſibly no Member of the inviſible Church, but in the eyes of the Church viſibly a dog or a ſwine, neither ought the externall ſymbols, that are even externally the holy things of God to be given to him: for otherwiſe, this Argument ſhall conclude, if one be baptiſed, and a member of the Church, though a dog, yet the pearls of the Goſpel are to be caſt to ſuch a dog, which *Eraſtus* himſelf denieth: And ſo this Argument hurteth *Eraſtus* as much as us.

That this Author ſaith, *God commanded thoſe that tranſgreſſed his holy Law with an high hand, and preſumptuouſly to be killed, leſt they ſhould live and prophane his holy things*; I defend not: But ſure *Eraſtus* erreth, who will have all ſuch to be killed by the Magiſtrate under the New Teſtament, becauſe they were killed in the Old: Then are we to ſtone the men that gathereth ſticks on the Lords day; the childe that is ſtubborn to his Parents, the Virgins, daughters of Miniſters that committeth fornication are to be put to death. Why, but then the whole judiciall Law of God ſhall oblige us Chriſtians as *Caroloſtadius* and others teach? I humbly concieve that the putting of ſome to death in the Old Teſtament, as it was a puniſhment to them, ſo was it a myſterious teaching of us, how God hated ſuch and ſuch ſins, and myſteries of that kinde are gone with other ſhadows. *But we read not* (ſaith *Eraſtus*) *where Chriſt hath changed thoſe Laws in the New Teſtament.* It is true, Chriſt hath not ſaid in particular, *I aboliſh the debarring of the leper ſeven dayes, and he that is thus and thus unclean ſhall be ſeparated till the evening*; nor hath he ſaid particularly of every carnall Ordinance and judiciall Law, it is aboliſhed. But we conceive, the whole bulk of the judiciall Law, as judiciall, and as it concerned the Republick of the Iews only, is aboliſhed, though the morall equity of all thoſe be not aboliſhed; alſo ſome puniſhments were meerly Symbolicall, to teach the deteſtation of ſuch a vice, as the boaring with an Aule the ear of him that loved his Maſter, and deſired ſtill to ſerve him, and the making of him his perpetuall ſervant. I ſhould think the puniſhing with death the man that gathered ſticks on the Sabbath was ſuch;

Page 336. 337.

such; and in all these, the punishing of a sin against the Morall Law by the Magistrate, is Morall and perpetuall; but the punishing of every sin against the Morall Law, *tali modo*, so and so, with death, with spitting on the face: I much doubt if these punishments in particular, and in their positive determination to the people of the Iews, be morall and perpetuall: As he that would marry a captive woman of another Religion, is to cause her first pare her nailes, and wash her self, and give her a moneth, or lesse time to lament the death of her Parents, which was a Iudiciall, not a Ceremoniall Law; that this should be perpetuall, because Christ in particular hath not abolished it, to me seems most unjust; for as *Paul* saith, *He that is Circumcised becomes debter to the whole Law*, sure to all the Ceremonies of *Moses* his Law: So I Argue, *à pari*, from the like, He that will keep one judciciall Law, because judiciall and given by *Moses*, becometh debter to keep the whole judiciall Law, under pain of Gods eternall wrath.

We do not teach that men are to be Excommunicated, for whatever scandalous sins deserve death at the hand of the Magistrate, whether they openly repent or not; if any give evident signification of their repentance for murther, they are not to be Excommunicated, for the end of Excommunication, being once obtained, which is the visible and known repentance, and saving of the offenders soul, the mean is not to be used, which is Excommunication. But if any commit murther, whether he repent or repent not, the Lord hath made no exception of regenerate or not regenerate, of men repenting or not repenting, he should die by the sword of the Magistrate, *Gen. 9.9.* It is true, some are to be Excommunicated for the very atrocity of the sin, it being parricide; but that is, because he giveth no positive signes of repentance to the Church, which is contumacy added to his parricide.

c 340. *Erastus* would prove, *That God would not have men debarred from the Sacraments, because they commit haynous sins to be punished with death by the Judge:* 1. Facinora sæpe sunt occulta, *such crimes are often unknown to the world.*

Ans. That which is denied, is not concluded a fault in Logick; for only scandals as scandals to the Church, and so known

to

to the Church are to be censured with Excommunication.

Erastus. *He thus would prove the same, often these crimes cannot be punished, as* David *durst not punish the murther of* Ioab, 2 Sam. 3. *Often for other causes they are neglected by the Magistrate, as* David *neglected to punish the incest and murther of* Absolon, *but shall we think such were not to come to the Temple and Sacraments? so* Psal. 14. David *saith, There was not one that doth good, those were not all punished by the Magistrate; yet were they not removed from the Sacraments.*

Ans. Let *Erastus* argue here, and we shall see his logick; *Those that commit parricides, sorceries, and do trample the holy things of God under feet, whom yet the* Magistrate *dare not punish, because of their power and greatnesse; those are not to be debarred from the Sacraments. But there be many scandalous persons in the Church, such as* Ioab, *whom the* Magistrate *dare not punish, for their greatnesse*; Ergo,

Ans. The Major is manifestly false, and a begging of the question: For *Erastus* saith, pag. 207. *He thinketh such ought not to be admitted to the Sacraments who will trample on the Sacraments and prophane them.* For though the Magistrate dare not punish them, which is his sinfull neglect, if they be dogs and swine (as often they are) and bloody men, such as *Ioab*, they ought not; yea, they never were by any Law of God, admitted to the Temple and Sacraments, what they did, *de facto*, or the Priests permitted, is not the question. It was *Davids* sinne that he took not away the head of bloody *Ioab* when he killed *Abner* and *Amasa*. 2. How doth *Erastus* prove that *David* neglected to punish the incest of *Absolon* (his sinfull neglect in not punishing his murther I yield) for *Absolon* was never in *Davids* power to punish after he committed that incest; possibly he neglected to punish his owne Concubines, that is but a conjecture. It is as like *Absolon* forced the Concubines to that incest as any other thing. 3. For that Psal. 14. *There is none that doth good*; it is spoken of the naturall corruption of all mankind, who therefore cannot be justified by the works of the Law, as *Paul* expoundeth it, *Rom.* 3.9,10,11,19,20,21. and not of scandals punishable by the Magistrates; and where this corruption did break out, in bloods within the Church, it ought to have been punished, both by the Magistrate and Church: so it is an argument yet, *a facto ad jus*, and a great inconsequence. 4. I aske for what cause doth the

the Spirit of God rebuke killing of the Children to *Molech*, and coming that same day to the Temple? Because it was a sinne and particularly a prophaning of the Sanctuary, which was one speciall holy thing to God, *Ezek.* 23.38,39. *Ier.* 7.8,9,10,11. It was no sin to come to the Temple: Sure it was commanded of God in his Law, as *Erastus* yieldeth. What was the sin then? to come with their hands full of blood, and of the unnaturall blood of their owne Children was the sinne; and yet if they had repented, to come after they had killed their Children, was no sinne, nor any prophaning of the Sanctuary of God. Then all their sinne was, that being Morally unclean, they came to the Sanctuary; *Ergo*, God forbade such bloody men to come to his Sanctuary; because God forbiddeth all sinne in his perfect Law; *Ergo*, those that deserved to dye by the hand of the Magistrate for open murther, deserved for that open murther to be debarred from the holy things of God, what ever *Erastus* say on the contrary.

Page 341. Erastus. *The adversaries contend, that some are to be excommunicated who deserve not to dye; as if any to a light injury, adde contumacy; But they should have a warrant for this, for this is a contradiction. (Every one who is clean according to the Law, should keep the Passeover) and this (some who is clean according to the Law, (to wit, who liveth wickedly and scandalously, and yet is Ceremonially clean) should not keep the Passeover.)*

Ans. We finde no distinction made by Christ, *Matth.* 18. and therefore we make none; He that offendeth his brother, (Christ maketh no exceptions of light or small offences) if he cannot be gained by admonitions, and be contumacious against the Church, he is reputed as a heathen and a publican; and this is our warrant. 2. Let *Erastus* answer this contradiction according to his owne way. *Every one who is Ceremonially clean should come to the Temple. Some who are Ceremonially clean, (to wit, who the same day have slaine their sons to* Molech*) should not come into the Temple.* The affirmative is holden as a truth by *Erastus*. The negative is the word of the Lord, *Ezech.* 23.38,39. 3. It is no contradiction which *Erastus* proposeth: For every one who is Ceremonially clean, should not keep the Passeover, except also he be Morally clean: *For he that discerneth not the Lords body, should not eat*; and the Lambe was no lesse Sacramentally the Lords body, then the Bread and Wine is his Body:

body, so the former is false, *in rei veritate.* The latter, to wit, *Every one Ceremonially cleane should not keepe the Passeover*, to *Erastus* is false: Now of two propositions contradicent, both cannot be false, *Erastus* may know this is bad Logick.

Erastus. *The Prophets rebuked the abuse and prophaning of the Sacraments, but they interdicted none circumcised of the use of the Sacraments, they said the sacrifices of the wicked were no more welcome to God, then if they offered things forbidden (dogs and swines blood) to God, but they never say the Priests are to be accused for admitting such into the Sacraments. They accuse and rebuke the Priests that they transgressed, and taught not the people aright, but never that they admitted such into the holy things of God: The Prophets say alwayes those things are wicked before God, but not in the face of the Church.* Erast. l. 6. c. 2. p. 341.

Ans. If the Prophets rebuked the prophaning of the Sacraments, then they also forbade prophane men to use the Sacraments, could the Prophets rebuke any thing but sin? *Ergo*, they forbade the sinne which they rebuked: *Ergo*, they forbade the man that had murthered his sonne to *Molech*, to come to the Sanctuary while he repented, for they could not rebuke but what they forbad. 2. If the bloody mans comming to the Sanctuary in that case, was nothing more acceptable to God, then the offering of a dog to God; then as the offering of a dog to God, was both forbidden to the people and to the Priest, so was the people and Priest both accused for the bloody mans comming into the Temple, the one should sin in comming, the other in admitting him to come. 3. The Priests are expresly accused for this, *Ezek.* 22, 25, 26. and 44. 23, 24. *Hag.* 2. 11, 12, 13. 4. Those were not onely sinnes *in foro Dei*, before God, for so when they were secret, they were sinnes before God, but when openly knowen, as *Jer.* 7. 9, 10, &c. *Ezek.* 23. 38, 39. they were the Priests sins: The bloody are forbidden to come to the Sanctuary; what then? were not the Porters whose calling it was to hold out the uncleane, to debar all whom the Lord forbade to come? Certainly, they excluded to their knowledge all whom God excluded, else how had they the

charge to keepe the doores of the Lords House? and the Priests are not onely rebuked for not instructing the people, but for erring in governing, *Ier.*5. 31. they are not Prophets, but Priests and Governours both Ecclesiasticall and civill, that the Prophet complaineth of, who did rule with rigour & cruelty over the people, beside *that they feed not the flocke but themselves,* Ezek.34.1,2,3,&c. *Ier.* 23. 1, 2, 3, 4. and 10. 21. and 22. 22. and 50. 6. *Micah* 2. 11. *Hos.*4. 18. *Micah* 7. 3.

Page 341. Erastus. *Though ill doers be not killed by the Magistrate, yet it followeth not that God for any such cause (deserving death) would have them debarred* à recto usu, *from the right use of holy things by some that are not Magistrates, nor are manifest Idolaters, Apostates, and Hereticks, though they be not put to death by the Magistrate, to be debarred by these fancied or imaginary Presbyters.*

Ans. 1. *Erastus* taketh ever for confessed, without any probation, that it is *rectus usus, the right use of the holy things of God,* that men with bloodie hands use them, which is πρῶτον ψεῦδος: a most false principle, *for he that killeth his children to Molech,* and that same day cometh into the Sanctuary of God, is so farre from the right using of the holy things of God, that the Lord saith expresly, his comming in in that condition *to the Sanctuary is,* (saith the Lord,) *the prophaning of my Sanctuary,* Ezek.23. 39. is this *rectus usus Ceremoniarum?* the right use *of the holy things of God?* It is not: 1. It is a forbidden use of holy things, *Isa.* 1. 13. *Mat.* 7.6. *Mat.* 5. 23. 2. It is a rebuked use of holy things, *Ier.* 7.9, 10, 11. *Isa.* 66. 3. 3. It is a prophaning of holy things, *Ezek.* 23. 38, 39. 4. It is such a use as bringeth damnation to the party that useth it, 1 *Cor.* 11. 27, 29. and it is all these *quoad externa, in externall things.* 2. *Erastus* could yeeld they be debarred, but by the Magistrate, not by *Imaginary Presbyters.* But all his Arguments, (as I shew before) doe prove they should be debarred *à recto usu,* from the right use of holy things by no man, no more then they should be debarred from giving of almes, or reading the word, this is *Erastus* his owne Argument; *I pray you may the Magistrate, or any on earth by any authority inhibite a Malefactor, or a Murtherer, who ought to die by the Magistrate, to read the Word,*

Erastus 341 *sequitur (si facinorosi sint arcendi à Sacramentis) eligendos esse qui malis interdicant oratione, lectione, Elcemosynarum distributione,* &c.

to

to give almes, to pray for mercy to God, because he hath killed a man?

3. If hereticks, apostates, open idolaters are to be debarred, by whom shall they be debarred: *Erastus*, pag. 207. thinketh they ought not to be admitted to the Sacraments, who shall debar them? The Magistrate, (saith he) But the Magistrate himselfe is the apostate, the heretick, the idolater. 2. He that may debarre from the seals, may admit to the seals; he that may do both, *Ex Officio*, is the formall dispenser of the seals by office, that the Magistrate is not: He that may put out, or take in into the house by supream power, is the Lord of the house: He who by office may admit some to the Table, and debarre other some, is the Steward. But the Magistrate is neither the lord of the Church, nor the steward of the house, by office. We do not hold this consequence; the Lord commanded ill doers to be killed; *Ergo*, He ordained in that same commandement, that they be Excommunicated? Nor do we say all those who were to be Excommunicated, were to be killed, as *Erastus* saith: Nor that Excommunication in the New Testament succeedeth in place of killing in the Old Testament; we see no light of Scripture going before us in these.

The Magistrate cannot admit, to, and debar from the Sacrament.

Erastus. *It is a Wonder that you say, that the godly Magistrate doth procure the externall Peace of the Common-wealth, but not the salvation of the subjects, that the Presbyters do only care for.* Page 346.

Ans. The Sword is no intrinsecall mean of the saving of any mans soul: It is true, the godly Magistrate may procure a godly life; but as a cause *removens impedimentum*, removing idolatry, heresie, wolves and false teachers from the flock, and commanding under the paine of the Sword, that Pastors do their duty. But Christ ascending on high, gave Pastors and Teachers to gather a Church; but not Magistrates armed with the Sword.

The sword no intrinsecall mean of gaining souls.

Erastus. *The Magistrates Sword is a most efficacious mean to bring men to the knowledge of God, nothing more effectuall then affliction, and the crosse, when right teaching is joyned therewith; examples teach us that in danger of death, men have seriously turned to God, who before could be moved by no exhortations. But you say all die not in the Lord, nor repent; nor (say I) do they all die in the Lord, who are taken away by diseases, or are excommunicated; yea, Excommunication maketh many hypocrites.* Page 347.

Ans. 1. *Erastus* here extolleth the Sword of the Magistrate, as a more

a more effectuall mean to salvation, then exhortations or the Gospel: But I read that Pastors are the Ministers by whom we beleeve, and that they are workers with God, and fellow-builders; and Fathers to convert, edifie to salvation, and beget men over again to Christ, 1 *Cor.* 3. 5, 9. 1 *Cor.* 2. 4, 15. *Ambassadors of God,* 2 Cor. 5. 20. *Friends of the Bridgroome,* 2 Cor. 11. 2. Ioh. 3. 29. *Angels,* Rev. 2. 1. But I never read any such thing of the Magistrate, and that the *Gospel is the power of God to salvation,* Rom. 1. 16. *The arme of the Lord,* Esay 53. 1. *Sharper then a two edged sword, lively and mighty in operation,* Heb. 4. 12. You never read any such thing of the Sword of the Magistrate, the rest are before answered.

Page 348. 349. Erastus. *Some may be changed in a moment, as the publican,* Luke 18. Zacheus, *The repenting woman,* Luke 7. *If therefore they professe repentance, they are not to be debarred from the Lords supper.*

Ans. Put it in forme thus; Those who may be changed and translated from darkenesse to light in a moment, and say, *that they repent, are to be admitted to the Lords supper:* I assume, But doggs and swine, and doggish and furious persecutors, who are to be debarred from the Sacraments: As *Erastus* saith, *pag.* 207. may be changed in a moment, and say they repent; *Ergo,* those are to be admitted to the Sacraments, who are not to be admitted to the Sacraments, let *Erastus* prove the Major proposition. 2. We finde no such sudden change in the Publican, *Zacheus*, or the repenting woman, as *Erastus* seemeth to insinuate. 3. Christ who knoweth the heart, and can change men in a moment, can at first welcome persons suddenly converted; *Ergo,* Must the stewards and dispensers of the mysteries upon a (may be) or a (may not be) reach the pearle of the Gospel to doggs and swine, whom they see to be such? It is a wide consequence, *He that bringeth his gift to the Alter,* may in a moment be changed; *Ergo, He should not leave his gift at the Altar,* and go and first be reconciled to his brother; He is presently without more adoe to offer his gift, his heart is straighted in a moment, if we beleeve *Erastus.* But the rather of this; that the man is in a moment changed: He is to be debarred, least his scandalous approaching to use the holy things of God, make the work of conversion suspitious to others. 4. This argument presupposeth that unvisible conversion, giveth a man right in *foro Ecclesiæ* in the Churches court, to the seals of the Covenant, and so there should

should be no need of externall profession at all, which is absurd.

Erastus. *Shall not then idolaters and apostates be debarred? as we (saith he) deny an idolater and an apostate to be a Member of the Church of Christ; so we thinke the man that defendeth his wickednesse, is not to be reckoned amongst the Members of the Church; And as we think the former are to be banished out of the society of Christians, so we think the latter are not to be suffered in that society.*

Ans. The Idolater that maketh defection, and the apostate were once Members of the Church; what hath made them now no Members? Who should judge them, and cast them out? the Magistrate? I answer, there is no Christian Magistrate: If the Church must do it, here truly, is all granted by *Erastus*, that he hath disputed against in six books, even this very Excommunication. But if there be a Christian Magistrate; what Scripture is there to warrant that he should cast out a Member out of Christs body? Here is an Excommunication without precept, promise, or practise in the word; we read that the Church of *Corinth* congregated together, hath a command to judge, and cast out a scandalous Member, 1 *Cor.*5. 4,5,11,12,13. out from amongst the midst of them: Let *Erastus* say as much from the New Testament, for his Magistraticall casting out. 2. What reason is there by *Erastus* his way, for casting out an idolater, and a man that defendeth his owne wickednesse? 1. May not God convert those suddenly; as he did the thiefe on the crosse, and *Saul*? *Ergo*, They should not be cast out. 2. The Magistrate cannot more cut off those from being Members of Christs-body; then he can remove their faith and internall communion with Christ. Now for this cause *Erastus* saith, the Church cannot Excommunicate, *pag.* 1. 2 *Thess.* 3. and 4. 3. *Christ and the Apostles* did neither cast out *Iudas, nor Scribes, Pharisees, or Publicans* out of the Church, though they were worse then idolaters. 4. *No helps of salvation are to be denied even to idolaters, and to men that defend their owne wickednesse,* but their remaining in the Church *amongst the godly, is a helpe of their salvation*; and God inviteth them to repentance, and the staying in the Church; And the Sacraments are to *Erastus* means of repentance, and this casting out must be to save them: for no power is given of God to the Magistrate or Church for destruction, but for edification: Now to put them out of the Church, that they may be saved, is as *Erastus* conceiteth,

to

to cast a lascivious Virgin out of the company of chaste Matrons, to the end she may preserve her chastity : I speak here all in the language of *Erastus*, who useth all those against casting any out of the Church, by Presbyters ; but they stand with equall strength, against his casting out of idolaters and apostates out of the Church, and so do the rest of his Arguments: Therefore this conclusion of *Erastus* is a granting us the whole cause ; after in six books, he hath pleaded none should be Excommunicated, he falleth on *Bellarmines Tutissimum igitur*, &c. when he had written six books against justification by faith,

Lastly, why should idolaters, apostates, and obstinately wicked men be excluded from the dispute of Excommunication and suspension from the Sacraments : for he knoweth that *Beza*, and Protestant Divines do make these the speciall, though not the whole subject of the dispute: Now *Erastus* concluding his six books, doth hereby professe he hath never faithfully stated the question, when he excludes those from the *subjectum questionis*, who especially heareth not the Church, and ought to be Excommunicated. Thus have I given an account, as I could, of the wit of *Erastus*, against the freedome of the Kingdome of the Lord Iesus.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the power of the Christian Magistrate in Ecclesiasticall Discipline.

QUEST. XIX.

Whether or no the Christian Magistrate be so above the Church in matters of Religion, Doctrine and Discipline, that the Church and her Guides, Pastors, and Teachers, do all they do in these, as subordinate to the Magistrate as his servants, and by his Authority? Or is the spirituall power of the Church, immediately subject to Iesus Christ only?

WEE know that *Erastus* who is Refuted by *Beza*, *Vtenbogard*, whom *Ant. Walens* Learnedly Refuteth, *Maccovius* opposed by the Universities and Divines of *Holland*, *Vedelius* Answered by *Gu. Apolonius* and others; and the Belgick Arminians in their Petition to the States, and *Hu. Grotius* against *Sibrandus Lubert*. Divers Episcopall Writers in *England* do hold, That the Guides of the Church do all in their Ministery by the Authority of the Christian Magistrate: I believe the contrary: And 1. We exclude not the Magistrate who is a keeper of both Tables of the Law, from a care of matters of Religion. 2. We deny not to him a power to examine Heresies and false Doctrine: 1. In order to bodily punishment with the sword: 2. With a judgement not *Antecedent*, but *Subsequent* to the judgement of the Church, where the Church is constituted. 3. With

The Church as the Church not subordinate to the Magistrate.

3. With such a judgement as concerneth his practise, lest he should in a blinde way, and upon trust, execute his office in punishing Hereticks, whether they be sentenced by the Church according unto, or contrary to the word of God as Papists dream. 3. We deny not, but the Prince may command the Pastor to Preach, and the Synod and Presbytery to use the keys of Christs Kingdom according to the Rules of the Word: But this is but a Civill subjection, though the object be spirituall: But the Question is not, 1. Whether the Christian Magistrate have a care of both Tables of the Law. 2. Whether he as a blinde servant is to execute the will of the Church, in punishing such as they discern to be Hereticks; we pray the Lord to give him eyes and wisdom in his Administration. 3. Nor thirdly, Whether he may use his coercive power against false Teachers, that belongs to the controversie concerning Liberty of Conscience. 4. The Question is not, Whether the Magistrate have any power of jurisdiction in the Court of Conscience, they grant that belongeth to the Preaching of the Word: But the Question is, touching the power in the externall Court of Censures. 5. The Question is not, Whether the power of exercising Discipline be from the Magistrate, I mean in a free and peacable manner, with freedome from violence of men: we grant that power, and by proportion also, that exercise of Discipline is from him: But whether the intrinsecall power be not immediatly from Christ given to the Church; this we teach, as the power of sayling peacably from danger of Pirats and Robbers is from the King; but the Art of Navigation is not from the King. But the Question is, whether the Magistrate by vertue of his office, as a Magistrate, hath Supream power to Govern the Church, and immediatly as a little Monarch under Christ above Pastors, Teachers, and the Church of God, to Iudge and determine what is true Doctrine, what Heresie, to censure and remove from Church-Communion the Seals and Church-offices, all scandalous persons, and that if Pastors, or Doctors, or the Church, Teach or dispense censures, they do it not with any immediate subjection to Christ, but in the Name and Authority of the Magistrate, having power from the Magistrate as his servants and delegates?

Arg. 1. To this we answer negatively, denying any such power to the Magistrate, and doe hold, that the Church, and Christs courts and

Assem-

Assemblies of *Pastors*, *Doctors*, and *Elders*, hath this power onely and immediately from Iesus Christ, without subordination in their office, to King, *Parliament*, or any Magistrate on earth by these Arguments. 1. Because in the Old Testament, the Lord distinguished two courts, *Deut.* 17.8. *If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgement*, 10. *Thou shalt come unto the Priests, the Levites, and unto the Iudge that shall be in those dayes, and inquire, and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgement. And thou shalt doe according to the sentence, which they of that place (which the Lord shall chuse) shall shew thee*, &c. There be here two Courts clearly; one court of Priests and Levites that were Iudges; another of the Iudge: Now the King by vertue of his Kingly office, might not usurpe the Priests office. 1. *Vzziah* was smitten with Leprosie for so doing. 2. It is evident in *Moses* his writing, that *Aaron and his sonnes the Priests and Levites were separated for the service of the Tabernacle, to teach the people, to carry the Arke, to sacrifice, to judge the* Leper, *and to judge between the clean and the unclean, to put out of the campe, out of the congregation the unclean, and to admit the clean*, Lev. 1. 7, 9, 12, &c. and 5. 8. and 7. 7. and 13. 3, 4, &c. 23. Numb. 5. 8. &c. and 18. 4, 5. 2 Chron. 29. 11. *You hath the Lord chosen to stand before him*, 1 Sam. 21. 1, 2. Lev. 21. 1. Iosh. 3. 8. 1 Kin. 8. 3. 1 Chron. 8. 9. 2 Chron. 5. 7. and 7. 6. and 8. 14. Zeph. 3. 4. Hag. 2. 11, 12. Mal. 2. 7, Deut. 10, 9. and 21. 5. Num. 1. 29. Deut. 10. 8, 18. Numb. 1. 50. and 3. 9, 12, 41. and 8. 10. Psal. 122. 5. *In Ierusalem there were set thrones of judgement, the thrones of the house of David*, Mat. 22. 21. Christ commanded *to give to Cesar the things that are Cesars*: and he in his own person refused to usurpe *Cesars* place, *Luke* 12. 14. *Man, who made me a Iudge?* and interdicted his Apostles thereof, *Luke* 22, 24, 25, 26. and yet appointed for them a Judicature of another kinde, *Mat.* 18. 15. *Mat.* 16. 19. *Ioh.* 20. 21. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Heb.* 13. 17. 1 *Cor.* 5. and if any should deny that the Civill Magistrate had another Court in which he judged, the Scriptures will refute him. 3. It is evident that *Iehoshaphat* did not institute, but restore those two courts, 2 *Chron.* 19. 11. *And behold Amariah the chiefe Priest is over you in all matters of the Lord, and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael the ruler of the house of Iudah, for all the Kings matters*; never any *Erastian* could satisfie either themselves or others, to shew us

Ezek. 44. 15.

what were those two courts, so distinguished by their two sundry Rulers. *Amariah* and *Zebadiah*, the one a Priest, the other a Magistrate. 2. By the different formall objects, *the matters of the Lord, the matters of the King*, and confounded they must be; if the King and Ruler be a judge in the matters of God, except God make him both a civill judge and a Prophet, as were *Moses* and *Samuel*, which yet were differenced when the God of order established his Church in *Canaan*. The Church convenes for a Church businesse, *Iosh.* 18. 1. to set up the Tabernacle, but for a civill businesse, to make war, the State conveneth, *Iosh.* 22. 12. 15. 16. *Iudg.* 21. 12. and *Ier.* 26. 8. there is the Church judicature discerning that *Ieremiah* was a false Teacher, and they first judge the cause, and *v.* 16. The Civill Iudicature discerneth the contrary, and under *Zorababel*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah*, they indured different judicatures; Iesus Christ was arraigned before *Caiphas* the High Priest for pretended blasphemie, before *Pilate* the civill judge for treason, but *Caiphas* was to determine onely by Law, *in quæstione juris* whether it was blasphemie which Christ had spoken, but he had no power by Gods Law to lead Witnesses or condemn Christ. Nor is it true, that the Priests had their government onely about Ceremonialls, for they were to judge of Morall uncleannes also, which even then debarred men from the holy things of God, as is cleare, *Hag.* 2. 12. *Ezek.* 44. 9. 10, 23, 24. and if any say that the Magistrate amongst the Iewes did judge of Ecclesiasticall things, and reformed Religion: We answer extraordinarily, the Magistrate might prophecie, and did prophecy, as did *Samuel*, *David*, *Solomon*: Why do not *Erastians* bring those examples to prove that *Kings*, *Provosts*, *Iustices*, may now preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments, which yet is unlawfull to them by grant of Adversaries, for the examples of the Kings amongst the Iewes, is as strong for preaching, as for governing; and because Prophets did judge the people of old, yet no Protestant Divine will say, that now Pastors may also usurpe the civill Sword.

Government peculiar to the Officers now, as to the Priests and Levites of old.

Now least any should object the case is not alike in the *Jewish* and *Christian Church*, surely the King of the Church hath no lesse separated such men as *Paul* and *Barnabas* for the Ministery now, then at that time, *Rom.* 1. 1, 2. *Act.* 2. And *sent labourers to his vineyard*, Luk. 10. 2. Matth. 20. 2. & 9. 37, 38. *And Ambassadors to*

Preach

Preach in his Name, 2 Cor. 5. 20. *Ministers of Christ, and Stewarts of the mysteries of God*, 1 Cor. 4. 1. *Men sent of God, whose feet are pleasant for their good News*, as were the Prophets of old, who were not only gifted to preach, but instructed with Divine Authority, as is clear *Rom.* 10. 14. 15. *Isa.* 52. 7. & 40. 9. *Nahum* 1. 15. Yea, and men that feeds the flock, not only by Preaching, but also Govern the Church, so that they *must take heed, that Ravening Wolves creep not into the Church, who shall not spare* the flock, *Act.* 20. 28. 29. Men who must be obeyed because *they Watch for our soules*, Heb. 13. 17. And can govern the Church, as well as they are apt to teach, 1 *Tim.* 3. 5. 2. *Men that labour amongst us, and are over us in the Lord*, 1 Thes. 5. 12. *And men who are to call to the work other faithfull men that are able to teach others*, 2 Tim. 2. 2. *Such as are separated from the affairs of this life*, such as Magistrates are not, 1 *Cor.* 6. 3. such as *Rule Well*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. and are *not to receive accusations, but under Witnesses, and are to lay hands suddenly on no man*, not to call them to the holy Ministery till they be sufficiently tryed, 1 *Tim.* 5 19, 20, 22. all which import teaching and governing. Now if all these directions be given to *Timothy* and other *Pastors till the end of the World*; then must all these directions be principally written to the Magistrate as the Magistrate; and these Epistles to *Timothy* agree principally to the Christian Magistrate, and to Pastors and Doctors at the by, as they be delegates and substitutes of the Magistrates; and that, by office, the *Emperour of Rome* was to *lay hands suddenly on no man, and commit the Gospel to faithfull men who could teach others*, and *was not to receive an accusation against an Elder*; and certainly, if the Magistrate call to office those that are *over us in the Lord*, and *if those who watch for our soules*, especially, be but the curates and delegates of the King and Parliament, then the King and Parliament behoved in a more eminent manner to watch for our souls; for directions and commandments of God in this kinde, are more principally given to the Master, Lord, and chief Governour of the house of God, (if the Magistrate be such) then to the servants & delegates. But where is there any such directions given to the Emperour, King, or Christian Magistrate, by any shadow of ground in the Word? It is not much to say, The *Magistrate was an heathen & an enemy at this time, and therefore those could not be written to him.* For 1. No force can strain these two Epistles to *Timothy*,

The Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* must chiefly be written to the Emperour and Magistrate, if Pastors be but Servants of the Magistrate.

and the other to *Titus*, which contain a form of Church-policy to any Christian Magistrate; for then the qualification of the King, if he be the supream Governour of the Church should far rather have been expressed, then the qualification of a Bishop and a Deacon, which is no where hinted at. 2. All these directions, notwithstanding this, do and must *actu primo*, agree to the Magistrate: for his office who is chief governour, & what he should be is described in the Word. 3. When Christ *ascended on high, he gave*, as a fruit of his ascension, sufficient means for his intended end, *The perfecting of the Saints, the gathering of his Body the Church, and the edifying thereof, even till We all meet in the Unity of the Spirit, and the knowledge of the son of God unto a perfect man*, Eph. 4. Now neither in that place, nor in any other place, did Christ give a Magistrate for the edifying his Body the Church; but only those that are but his *Delegates, Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers*, if the Magistrate be the only Governour of the Church, and he who sendeth into the Vineyard those who edifie the Body; the King should have been first in this Role, as the only supream gatherer, edifier and builder of the Church: It cannot be said, *The Ruling Elder then, because he is omitted here, should not be the gift of Christ, given to Edifie the Church; and by this it must be denied, that the King the Nurse-father of the Church, who is to take care that the Children be fed with the sincere milk of the Word, is given of God to edfiie the Church, because he is not named here.*

Argum. 4. *Ans.* Our Divines, as *Calvin, Beza, Marlorate*, do strongly gather from this place, that because the Pope pretended to be the Catholick edifier of the Church, is not here in this Text, nor in any other scripture, that therefore he is not the head of the Church; and the King, being pretended to be the only eminent gatherer of the Church, and *Supream Governour in all Causes, Civill and Ecclesiasticall*, he should especially have been set down here, he being a mixed person, and more then half a Church-officer in the minde of the Adversary: And there was no colour of reason, why the supream and only Head, and principall Governour of the Church, should be omitted, at least the Magistrate should be in some other Scripture as the only Church Governor; seeing the Adversaries make *Pastors, Doctors, Elders, and Deacons, only the Delegates and Servants of the Magistrate.* 1. As God calleth the King to governe

the

the people, by the free election of the people; so if the Magistrate *be called of God* to teach and govern the Church, this calling of his should be in the Scripture, as his calling to the Throne or Bench is, *Deut.* 17. 14, 15, *&c.* & 1. 15, 16. *Rom.* 13. *Tit.* 3. 1,2. But in neither the Old nor the New Testament finde we any Prince or Ruler separated for the holy things of God, to be *Priest, Apostle, Pastor, Prophet, Teacher* by vertue of his office, as if he were a *mixed person* (as the Adversarie say.) No *David* is called to Sacrifice, no *Constantine* to preach and Administrate the Sacraments by vertue of the Magistrates place. 2. If any Reply, that the Christian Magistrate is a means ordained for that spirituall end, the gathering and edifying the Church, in regard he keepeth not only the second Table of the Law, and so promoteth not only the Temporall good of the State in promoting mercy and Justice only, but also in procuring spirituall good to the people in preserving the first Table of the Law. I Answer, That the Christian Magistrate doth both; but 1. Not directly by being the intrinsecall means, *in actibus elicitis*, in elicite and intrinsecall acts, promoting edification in both Tables of the Law, of which the Scripture speaketh, *Eph.* 4. 11. but a far other way: 1. In imperated and commanded acts extrinsecally, as he doth command with the sword for Peaces cause in all callings, in sailing, trading, painting, &c. promoting it by carnall means by the sword, which belongeth not to the officers of Christs Kingdom. 2. Not necessarily, as the Pastors and Elders, without which Christ hath no externall visible Kingdom on earth, whereas he hath had, & often hath a compleat flourishing externall visible Kingdom without Magistrates: yea, where Magistrates have been open enemies to the Gospel. 3. Not directly the Magistrate doth this, but in so far as he admitteth (as *Triglandius* saith) the Church of Christ within his State, which he may, and often doth refuse to do, and yet be a compleat Magistrate; and therefore the Magistrate may two wayes procure the spirituall good of the Church: 1. By procuring that the Nurses give good and wholesome milk to the Church. 2. *Per modum removentis prohibens*, which is also a cause, for he may save the flock from great temptations, when by his sword he driveth away the *Wolves from the flock*: But not any of these bringeth the Magistrate within the list of the number of these intrinsecall, 2. Necessary, 3. Spirituall gifts, which Christ ascending on high, gave

Trigland. de civi. & Eccles. potest. disser. Theolo. c. 4. p. 80.

gave for the Edifying of his Body the Church.

Arg. 3. Two powers so different as spirituall and temporall: 2. As powers carnall of this world, and spirituall not of this world: And 3. Both immediatly subject, the one to God the creator, the other to Christ the Redeemer and Head of the Church, and so co-ordinate, and supream both of them in their own kinde, cannot be so subordinate, as the temporall should be the supream in the same kinde, the spirituall the inferiour and subordinate. But these two powers are so different, as spirituall and temporall, carnall of this world, spirituall not of this world, the one subject as supream immediatly to God creator, the other supream immediately subject to God the redeemer; *Ergo*, Those powers of Governing are not so subordinate as the Temporall should be supream, the spirituall subordinate to it.

Civill and Ecclesiasticall powers immediatly from God.

The Major is undeniable, for it involveth a contradiction that two supreame co-ordinate powers should be two, not Supreame, but subornidate powers: The same way I prove the Assumption. 1. The Magistrates power is supreame from God, *Rom.* 13. 1. *The Powers that are be of God*, Prov. 8. *By me Kings reigne*, for no Ecclesiasticall power, nor any power on earth, interveenes between God the Creator, and the power of the civill Magistrates; But God who giveth being to a society of men, *hoc ipso*, because they are a society of reasonable men, hath given to them a power immediately from himselfe, to designe such and such to be their Rulers: Shew us any higher power above the Magistrates, but God the creator making the civill power. Never man dreamt that the Spirituall power of the Church doth interveen as an instrumentall cause of the politick power. 2. By order of nature, a politick power is first: men are first men in naturall and politick society, ere they be in a supernaturall pollicy, or a Church; and Christ did not make a spirituall power by the intervention of a civill power. 2. The power of the two Kingdoms are distinguished by Christ, *John* 18. 36. *Iesus answered, my Kingdome is not of this World*, (then the power thereof is not of this World,) *if my Kingdome were of this World, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Iewes.* The one power is coactive by the Sword, the other free, voluntary by the Word. *Erastus* had no reason to infer thence that Christs Kingdome is onely internall and invisible,

invisible, not externall and visible, because Christ oppoſeth his Kingdom to a fighting Kingdom, using the ſword to defend him from the *Iewes*, that he ſhould not be taken and crucified, as is clear in the words, but he oppoſeth not his Kingdome to an externall viſible Kingdom, for his Church viſible conſiſting of viſible Officers is his Kingdom, *Eph.* 4. 11, 12. 1 *Cor.* 12. 13 &c. The Word of the Kingdom is audible, and it is viſibly profeſſed, and Miniſters are viſibly and externally called to the holy Miniſtery, *by the laying on of the hands of the Elders* and voices of the People; but he oppoſeth his Kingdome to a Kingdome fighting with the Sword, and uſing the coactive power of the ſword to ſave him from being apprehended and crucified by the *Iewes*: Now this is the Magiſtrates Kingdome, *for he beareth not the ſword in vain*, Rom. 13. 4. and ſo Chriſt evidently proveth in theſe words, that the power that beareth the ſword, which is the very eſſence of the Magiſtrates office as a Magiſtrate, is not a part of his Kingdome, for his Kingdome is of another World, and Spirituall; but the Magiſtrates power is of this World, and uſeth worldly weapons, as the ſword. Then it is evident that the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate, 1. Is not ſubordinate to Chriſt as Mediator and head of the Church. 2. That when it was ſaid, *All power in heaven and earth is given to the Mediator Chriſt*: The ſenſe cannot be, the power of the ſword was given to him as Mediator, to be a judge and a Ruler on earth, which he refuſed, *Luke* 12. 13, 14. (though as God he hath the power of the ſword.) 3. That the ſupream Magiſtrate as Magiſtrate is not the onely Deputie, Delegate, and Vicar of Chriſt as Mediator; for if Chriſt as Mediator have a ſubſtitute and Deputie, ſuch as the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate, who beareth his bloodie ſword to cut off the enemies of the Church, and to fight for Chriſt: then 1. Chriſts Kingdome ſurely ſhould be of this World. 2. By the ſame reaſon, ſince as Mediator he is Prieſt, and a High Prieſt to offer a ſacrifice to God, as all Prieſts muſt doe that are proper Prieſts *Heb.* 8. 3. *c.* 9. 7. *c.* 10. 14. *c.* 10. 1, 2, 3, &c. there muſt be Prieſts under Chriſt properly ſo called, to offer ſome bloodie ſacrifice ſatisfactorie for ſinne, which is blaſphemie to ſay, I meane proper Prieſts; for otherwiſe in a figurative and borrowed ſenſe, all beleevers are Prieſts to offer themſelves to God, *Rom.* 12. 1. *Revel.* 1. 5. 6. 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. but not the Deputies of the High Prieſt *Ieſus Chriſt*

The Magiſtrate not ſubordinate to Chriſt as Mediator.

Christ, and by the same reason he must have Prophets under him that are Vicars and Deputies, which is unpossible for Christ as Prophet and great Prophet, is essentially Lawgiver, and the Author of Cannonick Scripture, and he who really by a supernaturall power teacheth the heart, but so he hath no Deputies, nor any Ministers or Prophets, nor any under Law-givers, or under Prophets, which by an action or any active power communicated to them, can as under Lawgivers devise any part of Law or Gospell or any other part of Cannonick Scripture, or have any active influence supernaturall to make a new heart: Hence all our Divines say, Christ as Mediator and King of the Church hath no Deputies, neither King, nor High Priest, nor Pope, nor Saint. 4. It must follow, that the Magistrate who as Magistrate beareth the Sword, is not the head officer of the Church under the Mediator; for as Magistrate he must act with the sword, upon the Church as the Church, and the Ministers of the Gospell as they are such; whereas when the Magistrate doth act as Magistrate on the Ministers with the sword, he doth it on them as men erring and sinning: But onely so he procureth as a Magistrate the spirituall good of the Church as the Church, indirectly and by the sword, in driving away Hereticks and wolves from the flock.

Argum. 2. That Church which is the pattern and rule to all the Churches unto the end of the world, in those things that belongeth to a Church, as a Christian Church, must be our rule and paterne in Government: But in the Apostolick Church of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Thessalonica*, *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Philippi*, *Colosse*, *the seven Churches of Asia*, planted and framed up as perfect Christian Churches, by the Apostles, the Magistrate was not the only supream Governour of Churches; nor did the Apostles, Elders and Teachers in those Churches, nor the Church, act, preach, dispence the Sacraments, rule, governe as servants, under, and through, and from the Authority of the Magistrate or King, as his Vicars, deputies, and servants; But by immediate Authority from Iesus Christ placed in them without the interveening mediation of Magistrates; *Ergo*, that Church should be the patern of our Church, though the adversaries deny the proposition, to wit, that the Apostolick Churches as Apostolick, should be our patern in all things in regard that the Magistrates were then heathens & enemies to the Church and Gospel,

and

and so *de facto, actually*, and by accident could not be the supream officers and Governours of the Church; yet now, when we have Christian Magistrates, that are nursefathers to the Church, and beleevers professing the Gospel, such as *David, Solomon, Iosiah, Iehoshaphat*, and *Ezekiah*, and other godly *Princes of Israel* and *Iudah* were, and therefore that the Church, as it is a Generall, both to the Iewish and Christian Church, should be our paterne in Government; yet we have (though I say, they deny this Major) a great advantage of the adversaries in these. 1. We have the first Christian Church to be our paterne, and the *New Ierusalem that came downe from Heaven, from God*, Revel. 21. 10. *The mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. *Which is builded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himselfe being the chief corner stone*, Ephe. 2. 20. to be our rule and paterne, and all that was prophecied, though not compleatly in all the degrees of the Church of the Apostles, was then fulfilled, as touching the essence of a Church. 2. Yet here the Magistrate was no chief officer. 3. The adversaries must prove *Moses, David, Solomon*, and those godly Kings, as Kings and Magistrates, and *virtute officij*, were supream rulers and Church-officers, and so that *Constantine*, and all the godly *Princes* and *Emperours*, were, by vertue of their office, as Magistrates, all such Prophets, as were *Moses, David, Solomon*: for certainly, they as Prophets wrote Scripture, had the form and structure of the Temple revealed to them of God, received Laws from God for the Priests: if our Kings as Magistrates now can do the like, we shall then say something to their Headship over the Church. 4. And if they reformed Religion in the time of the defection of the Priests, when they were holy and zealous, and walked with God, and *did right in the sight of the Lord like unto David*, such as *Iehoshaphat, Iosiah*, when the Priests were corrupt: we shall grant the like to Parliaments made up of *Iosiahs* and *Ezechiahs*; when the Assembly of Divines are corrupt, Heterodox, and all the Pastors have corrupted their wayes. 5. Civill punishing of Church-men when they are Hereticall and scandalous, we heartily yield to Magistrates. But that Magistrates as such should Excommunicate and admit such to the Sacrament, and reject other such, and rebuke, or, that the Magistrate as the Magistrate, did of old judge between the clean and the unclean, cast out from the congregation and camp, and receive

The patern Church of the Apostles not ruled by the Magistrate.

Erast. and Mr. Pryn grant, that there is such an ordinance as excommunication.

in, and so governe the Church, is altogether unwarranttable. Now the adversaries, as *Erastus, grant that Idolaters, Apostates, and extreamly prophane men, are to be cast out of the Christian society, and not to be suffered there; and also that Dogs, and Swine, and Apostates, & persecuters, are neither to be admitted to hear the Word, nor partake of the Sacraments:* So also Mr. *Pryn*, if Magistrates must cast them out of the Church by vertue of their office, and judge as Magistrates who are prophane, and who truly feare God, and who are *dogs* and Apostates, who not, surely then Magistrates as Magistrates must discerne between *the cleane and the unleane*, as Priests of old, *and must separate the precious from the vile*, as the Prophets did of old, and so were the *mouth of God, and must stand before the Lord*, Ier. 15. 19. Then must Magistrates as Magistrates be Pastors called in the Pulpit as well as in the Throne, and the Bench, and that by vertue of their calling, which neither *Erastus*, nor the reverend Mr. *Pryn* will owne. Now if the Elders of the Church with the consent of the people, must cast such out of the Church, and from communion in the holy things of God, here is in expresse termes the very Ecclesiasticall Excommunication which Mr. *Pryn* denieth to be an Ordinance of God, and yet it must be commanded by Iesus Christ in these words, *Mat. 7. 6. Give not holy things unto dogs*, and therefore keep not in Church communion the prophane, and (by the way) Mr. *Pryn* to me yeeldeth the cause, and granteth that Excommunication and suspension from the Sacraments, doe both fall under this precept of Christ, *Mat. 7.* That which falleth under a command of Christ, to me is a Divine Ordinance. 2. He saith also, reasoning against bare suspension from the Sacraments, *Obstinate scandalous sinners make no conscience at all of receiving the Sacrament, and voluntarily suspend themselves there-from, in case they be freely admitted to other Ordinances, it being onely the totall Exclusion from the Church, and all Christian society (not any bare suspension from the Sacrament,) which worketh both shame and remorse in excommunicate persons, as* Paul *resolveth* 1 *Thes.* 3. 14. 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. compared with 1 *Cor.* 1. to v. 10. 3. This is, *in terminis, excommunication* proved from divers places of Scripture, for it is a totall Exclusion from the Church, and all Christian society, working shame and remorse as *Paul* resolveth: We seeke no more, *Pauls* resolution to us is a Divine right.

Those

Confirm. Thes. l. 6. c. 2. p. 349. Sanè ut Idololatram & apostatam negamus membrum esse Ecclesiæ Christi sic etiam nequitiam suam defendentem, inter membra Ecclesiæ consendum esse. Et quemadmodum illos ex Christiano cœtu judicamus exterminandos, sic hos quoque putamus in eo cœtu non esse ferendos. Erastus confirm. Thes. l. 3. c. 3. p. 207.

Mr. Pryn in his vindication of four serious questions, p. 30. 31. Vindication of four serious questions page 52.

Those words of that Learned and Reverend man have (give me leave by the way to say, for I hope worthier then I am, do answer fully all he hath said in this subject) all that we crave. For 1. obstinate men will voluntarily suspend themselves from the Sacrament: *Ergo*, the Church should not suspend them onely, but also Excommunicate them; I grant all, if they be obstinate, they are to be not only suspended, but also excommunicated; *Ergo*, they are not solie and onely to be suspended, *Pro hac vice*, for this time; it followeth no waies, all that this Reverend Lawyer saith against sole suspension from the Sacrament of an obstinate offender, is nothing against us; if he be obstinate, he is not onely to be suspended from the Sacrament, but also if he goe on in refusing to heare the admonitions of brethren, and of the Church, he is to be excommunicated; *Ergo*, he is not first, *hac vice*, to be suspended from a confirming Ordinance given to those onely who are supposed to have the life of faith, and can onely eat and drinke spiritually and by faith the body and blood of Christ; It followeth not. I thinke Mr. *Pryn* would not have Hereticks and Apostates suddenly and at the first totally (as he saith) *excluded from the Church, and all Christian society*, sure we owe some gentlenes and patience even to them, *If God peradventure may give them Repentance to scape out of the snare of the Devil*, 2 Tim. 2. 24. 25, 26. yet if an Heretick and Apostate that same day that the Lords Supper were to be celebrated should deny the Resurrection, and Iesus Christ to be *God blessed for ever*, and not equall with the Father, nor consubstantiall with him, and withall should that same day have offered his childe to *Molech*, and yet professe his desire to come to the Lords Supper, professing he had tryed and examined himselfe, and his desire to come to eate and drinke with Iesus Christ the great Prophet of his Church; Would not Mr. *Prynne* thinke he should not be admitted to the Lords Supper, and yet that he should not totally be excluded from the Church, and all communion from the Church and holy things of God? I should think if he cannot be presently excommunicated, yet he should not be admitted to the Sacrament, for sure he cannot but be in a doggish and swinish disposition in one degree or other: And my reason is, he is as *Erastus* saith, *non rectè institutus*, not rightly instructed, but heterodoxe, and so cannot try and examine himselfe,

while he be better principled in the faith: so a suspension for a time from the Lords supper, and *ex natura rei*, without totall exclusion from the Church and all Christian society, were as necessary, (whether the Magistrate or Church suspend, I dispute not now) as a degree of punishment, or a preventing of eating of damnation is necessary *hic & nunc*: O, but saith Master *Prinne*, *Christ knew that Iudas was worse then an heretick, and yet he denied not to admit him to the Supper*; Ergo, though we knew such a one, *the Sacrament being a converting Ordinance, it followeth not that we should debarre him from the Sacrament.*

Ans. Whether *Iudas* did eat the Supper of the Lord, or not, I think nothing of the matter; only Master *Prinne* hath *duram provinciam*, and a very hard task to prove it from Scripture, If I were to examine his book, I should deny his consequences from the Evangelists, for not any of them can prove that *Iudas* did communicate at the last Supper. But, 1. Christs example in this being an act of Christ, as God, permitting the greatest hypocrisie on earth, is no rule to the Church to give the Lords Supper to *Iuddasses*; First, *Iudas* was visibly and infallibly to Christ, a man who deserved to be totally excluded out of the Church and all Christian societie, and to Christ a knowne traitor, a Devill, an hypocrite; *Ergo*, as Christ did not exclude him out of the Church; neither should the Saints now exclude from their society; nor should the Christian Magistrate (as *Erastus* and Master *Prinne* thinketh) exclude Iudasses and knowne traitors, and knowne Devills, and knowne children of the Devil out of the Church; this is to *Erastus* and Master *Prinne* both absurd. 2. Christ did eat and drink with *Iudas* knowing him to be all these; *Ergo*, we may eat and drink with knowne traitors also, the contrary is a truth, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9, 10. 11. 2 *Thess.* 3, 14, 15, *Rom.* 16. 17. evident enough. 3. Christ preached the Gospel to those that he knew sinned against the Holy Ghost, to the Pharisees who persecuted Christ to death and others, *Math.* 12. 31, 32, 33, 34. *Ioh.* 15. 22, 23, 24, 25. *Ioh.* 7. 28, 29. *Ioh.* 12. 35, 36, 37, 38. *Ioh.* 10. 31, 32. *Ioh.* 11. 47, 48. and this is by the exposition of *Erastus l.* 3. *c.* 3. *pag.* 307. 308. and Master *Prinne* his vindication, *pag.* 38, 39. *To give holy things to dogs: so* Mr. *Prinne saith, that by doggs and swine, are meant only such infidels and heathen, who refuse to imbrace and beleeve the Gospel, or harbour or entertain the preachers of*

it, (of which the text is principally intended) as well as the Sacraments, or of such open contemners, persecutors of the Gospel and Ministers, who runne upon and teare the preachers thereof, trampling the pearls of the Gospel, and the tenderers of them under their feet, as the Text resolves in terminis, Mat.7.6. Mat.10,14,15. Luk.9.5. Act. 13.46. or open Apostates. 2. *Pet.*1.2,21,22, &c. hence by this we may give the pearls of the Gospel to such dogs as the Pharisees, for to them Christ tendred the pearle of the Gospel. 4. Christ might have hindred, being God equall with the Father, the Pharisees and Iews to malice him; *Ergo,* he being above the Laws that he gives to us, doth not in this example warrant us to cast the pearls of the Gospel to such as we know to be Iudasses, Pharisees, and malicious haters and heart-murtherers of Christ. 2. There is not the like reason of preaching the word, and dispensing the seals, 1. Because the word is a converting ordinance out of question; and preached to heathen and to the non-converted, *though they refuse to imbrace and beleeve the Gospel, and refuse to entertaine the preachers of it*: as is clear, *Act.*19.22,23,24,25. *Tit.*1.10,11,12,13. 2 *Tim.*3.25, 26,27. The Texts that Master *Prinne* alledgeth, that the Gospel should not be preached to heathen who refuse to imbrace and beleeve the Gospel, to wit, *Mat.*10.14,15. *Luk.*9.5. *Act.*13.46. are to no purpose, for *Mat.*10. *Luk.*9. is but a Temporary Commandement, given for a time, that the Disciples should depart from those houses of *Iudea* (there is nothing of the heathen; But by the contrary the Apostles are forbidden to go to Samaritanes or Gentiles at all, *Mat.*10.5,6.) who would not receive the peace of God in the Gospel, which precept the Apostles in the story of the Acts, did not observe; but preached the Gospel to many heathen who refused to imbrace and beleeve the Gospel: As *Act.*16. *and* 17. *and* 19. 2. The place, *Act.*13.15. is meant of the blaspheming Iews, to whom *Paul* preached long after they persecuted *and stoned the Prophets, and had killed the Lord of life,* Act.2. and 4. and 8. and 9. Mat.23.37,38. 3. Those places, are to better colour of purpose brought by Arminians, and Socinians to prove, that the Gospel is preached to people for their good entertainment thereof, and denied to others for their unworthinesse, and because they will not welcome it; So the Arminians in the conference at Hague, *pag.*87,88,89. *God sendeth the Gospel not according to his absolute Will,* sed ob alias causas in homine

The Gospel preached to those to whom the Sacraments cannot be dispensed.

meine latentes, for secret causes in man. *Arminius* against *Perkins*. p. 199. *The Will of God in sending the Gospell, hath causes in the Will of man according to that*, habenti dabitur: So *Corvinus ad Wallachros*, p. 44. *Socinus Comment. in* 1. *Epist.* Ioh. c. 4. p. 307. saith the same; and Mr. *Pryn* is pleased in the same sense to cite them, I conceive imprudently, for I beleeve that Reverend and learned man doth hate those impious Sects, the Enemies of the grace of God; but truly if this be a rule to Pastors to spread the Gospell, that they are to offer and give the pearle of the preached Gospell to those that willingly receive it, and harbour the preachers, and presently to depart and preach no more the word of the Kingdom to those who refuse it, as the places *Mat.* 10. 14. & *Luke* 9. 5. carry that sense, because they are *Heathens who refuse to embrace and beleeve the Gospell, and harbour the Preachers*, as (the worthy Divine saith,) conceiving that to *be a casting of Pearles to Dogs and Swine*; I see not how the Preachers & spreaders of the Gospel to the Heathen, are to beleeve that God out of meer grace, & the good pleasure of his will, without respect to good or bad deserving, sendeth the Gospel to some, and denieth it to others. 3. Though the Sacrament of the Supper be a converting Ordinance in this sense, that it corroborateth faith and conversion, where it was once, and so applyeth the Promises to one who before beleeved, yet it is not a converting ordinance, that is to be administred to one dead in sins and trespasses, as the word is, for then at the first Sermon that ever is preached to a Heathen, if he should say, though for base & worldly ends known to the Church that he desired to have the Sacraments, we are obliged to beleeve that he sincerely desireth these Seals, and instantly at the same sermon to baptise him, & administer the other Seal of the Lords Supper to him; for how can we deny converting Ordinances to those who desire them? say our adversaries. 4. An ordinance that cannot be dispensed to a Heathen, remaining a Heathen, and to an unconverted man knowne to be an unconverted man, is not an Ordinance that ought to be dispensed, as the ordinance of the Word, and as the first converting ordinance, to so many as we may safely dispense the Word unto, and if it be first a converting ordinance, as the preaching of the Word is; then it is to be dispensed to all those to whom we are to preach the Word. But *Erastus* and Mr. *Pryn* grant, we may preach the Word to Heathen

The Sacrament a confirming ordinance.

then remaining Heathen, and if they deny it, (as they yeeld it) the Apostles did preach the Gospel to the Heathen remaining Heathen, but they never admitted, nor can we admit to the Lords Supper Heathen remaining Heathen, nor could the *Iewes* upon the same ground, admit to the Passeover the uncircumcised: now then the preaching of the Word to some cannot make the Church and preachers guilty of casting pearles to Swine, and of partaking of their sin, *whose hearing is not mixed with faith*; and yet if the Church and Ministers should admit to the Sacraments Heathen remaining Heathen, they should prostitute holy things to Dogs, and be guilty of an Heathen mans eating of his owne damnation; Hence this Assertion of Mr. *Prynne* must be a great mistake, *That Ministers may as well refuse to preach the Word to such unexcommunicated, grosse, impenitent, scandalous Christians, whom they would suspend from the Sacrament, for feare of partaking with them in their sinne, as to administer the Sacrament to them, because* (saith he,) *unprofitable hearing is as damning a sinne, as unworthie receiving of the Sacrament*: 1. Because there is and may be discovered to bee in the congregation, persons as unworthy as Heathen, such as *Simon Magus*, yea, latent *Iudasses*, *Parricides*, who are in the visible Church while God discover their hypocrisie; but we may lawfully preach the Word to men as uncapable of the Word as Heathen, and as unworthie; as Christ and the Apostles did, who did not contravene that, *Cast not Pearles to Swine*, yet we cannot give the Sacraments to men knowne to be as scandalous, uncapable, and unworthy as Heathen; but we must prostitute holy things to Dogs, and partake of their sinne; for this is *non causa pro causa*, that Mr. *Prynne* bringeth, to say *we may as well refuse to preach the Gospell to scandalous impenitents, as to administer the Sacrament, without partaking of the sinnes of either, because unprofitable hearing is as damning a sinne, as unworthy receiving the Supper*; This *Because* is no cause: it is true, they are both damnable sinnes, but how proveth he that Preachers partake equally of both? I can shew him a clear difference which demonstrateth the weakneſse of this connexion. 1. Vnprofitable hearing of the Gospell in a Heathen is as damning a sin, as hypocriticall receiving of the Sacrament is a sinne, they are not *equalia peccata*, but sure they are *equè peccata*; but I may preach the Gospel to a Heathen, and not

Vindication p. 35.

not partake of his sinne of unprofitable hearing, for I may be commanded to preach to a Heathen remaining a Heathen, as *Paul* preached to *Felix*, to the *scoffing Athenians*, to the persecuting *Iews*, and giving obedience to the command of God, freeth me from partaking of his unprofitable hearing; But I cannot administer the Lords Supper to an Heathen remaining a Heathen, without sharing in his sin; and suppose a Heathen remaining a Heathen would croud in to the Lords Table, as of old many Heathen fained themselves to be *Iewes*, desiring to serve the time, 1 *Sam.* 14.21. yet I should partake of the Heathens unworthy receiving, if knowing him to be a Heathen serving the time, and crouding in amongst the people of God, I should administer the Lords Supper, because I have no command of God to administer the Lords Supper to a Heathen man, nor could *Paul* administer the Sacrament to the scoffing *Athenians*, or to *Felix*, without taking part with them in their prophaning of the Lords Table. 2. The necessity of preaching the Word, it being simply necessary to the first conversion of a sinner, putteth Pastors in a case that they may, and ought to preach the Gospell to Heathen, and to thousands knowne to be unconverted without any participation of their unprofitable hearing, and the non-necessity of the Lords Supper, or the Seale of the Covenant, and the nourishing of their souls to life eternall, who visibly and to the knowledge of those who are dispensers of the Sacrament, prophane, and abominably wicked, putteth those same dispensers in a condition of being compartners with them in the prophaning of the holy things of God, if they dispence the bread to those that are knowingly dead in sinnes, so the Gospell may be taught in Catechisme to Children, *Deut.* 6.6,7. 2 *Tim.* 3.15. *Exod.* 12.26,27. *Gen.* 18.19. *Prov.* 22.6. because there is a necessity they be saved by hearing, *Rom.* 10.14. 1 *Cor.* 1.23. but there is no necessity, but a command on the contrary, that the Lords Supper be dispensed to no children, nor to any that cannot examine themselves, and they may be saved without the Sacrament, but not ordinarily without the Word; nor were it enough to forwarne Apostates, and persecutors, and Hypocriticall heathen, and children, that if they eate unworthily they eate their owne damnation, as Mr. *Pryn* saith, and yet reach the Sacrament to those, for the dispensers then should cast Pearls to some Dogs and Swine

We partake of the sins of many in dispensing to them the Sacrament, and not in preaching to them the Word.

Vind. p. 36

con-

contrary to *Mat.*5. 6. and they should be free of the guilt in polluting of holy things, if they should give them a watch-word, say they were about to prophane the holy things of God, before they committed such wickednesse. Nor doe we as Mr. *Pryn* saith, nor know we, or the Scriptures any such distinction, *as sealing externally to the senses of any receiving the Lords Supper*, lawfully divided, (sinfully it may be divided, but there is no Law for sinne, no print, no authority of men for it,) from *the internall sealing*, nor heard we ever of two sorts of conversion, one *externall from Paganisme to the externall profession of the faith, Wrought extraordinarily by Miracles Without the Word, and ordinarily by Baptisme in Infants; and another internall from formall profession, to an inward imbracing of Christ and his merits.* 1. Because the Stewards and Ambassadors of Christ, may not dare to play with the Sacraments as children doe with nuts, to seal to mens senses and fancies Christ and spirituall nourishment in him, and part in his body broken and blood shed, in those who visibly have nothing of faith to their discerning, and of the life of Christ, but onely senses and fancie, such as all visibly and notoriously scandalous walking after the flesh, all Hereticks, Apostates, knowne and unwashen Hypocrites have, and no more. 2. All heathen and unbaptized have senses, and are capable of externall washing, and externall and Sacramentall eating, as well as others are, but are they capable of the Seals, because they have bodies to be washed, and teeth and stomacke to eat Sacramentally? And have Ministers warrant enough to dispense the Sacraments to all that have senses? *But they must be Within the visible Church also, ere they be capable of Sacraments*, Mr. *Pryn* will say; but I aske by what warrant Mr. *Pryn* alledgeth that the Supper of the Lord is a converting ordinance as well as the Word, and that Pastors may without sinne dispense the Sacraments to those to whom they preach the Word, but they may preach the Word to Heathen remaining Heathen; *Ergo*, may they dispense the Lords Supper to Heathen remaining Heathen? What more absurd? yet, remaining Heathen, they are as capable of Mr. *Pryn* his sense-sealing, and sense-converting Sacraments, as any sound beleever. 3. A sealing to the senses cannot be divided from the inward sealing by the Spirit; neither in the intention of God, for the externall sealing without the internall is Hypocrisie, and

Vindication p. 40. 41.

God cannot intend Hypocrisie, nor can this division be in regard of the nature of the Sacrament, for i doth seal to us our spirituall nourishment in Christ, except we sinfully separate the one from the other, and sin is no ordinance of God. 4. What word of Christ hath Mr. *Pryn* for *extraordinary conversion of men by Miracles Without the Word?* He must conceive with *Arminians* and *Socinians*, that many are converted that never heard of that precious name of Jesus, without which there is no salvation, *Act.* 4 11. or of a faith in Christ, as *Moses Amyraldus* dreameth, without the knowledge of Christ, and may write books *de salute Ethnicorum*, for this externall conversion doth lead of its owne nature to internall conversion and salvation: This may make us fancie somewhat of the salvation of *Aristotle*, *Seneca*, *Cicero*, *Aristides*, *Scipio*, *Regulus*, without the Law or Gospell, this way of extraordinarily saving men by Miracles without the Gospell, is the doctrine of *Arminians* and *Socinians*; so say the *Arminians* at the Synod of *Dort*, pag. 334, 335. *Those whom God hath deprived of the Gospell, he hath not precisely rejected them from a communion of the benefits of the Gospell.* Adolphus Venator. adver. Draconos p. 84. saith, *The heathen are saved without the Gospell, if they can but pray*, Ens Entium miserere mei, *Socinus prælec. Thelo.* c. 3. telleth us of an inspired word that saveth us, called *verbum interius*. You may please Schoolmen thus, such as *Granadus Contr.* 8. *de grat. tract.* 6. *disp.* 1. *numb.* 43. *did.*. *Ruiz. de Predesti. se.* 8. *numb.* 7. *Alexand. Alens.* 8. *p. q.* 69. *memb.* 5. *art.* 3. *De bonis* Philosophis *sic credo*, &c. *Roa. lib.* 1. *De Provident. quæst.* 7. *n.* 50. *Vega lib.* 13. *in Trident. c.p.* 12. *Enriquez Tom.* 2. *De ultimo fine*, *c.* 14 *num.* 6. *quod lib.* 8. *quæst.* 3. *Vasqu z* 1. *par. disp.* 97. and *c.* 5. *Soto lib.* 1. *de nat. & grat. c.* 18. *ad.* 2. *Francis. Sonnius in demonstrat. Tract.* 12. *de consiliis c.* 8. *Camerarius lib.* 1. *de grat. c.* 8. *& lib.* 7. *c.* 8. who doe all of them send all the good Philosophers and white Moralists *to heaven by Miracles, inspirations, extraordinary workes of providence, and that without any rumour of Christ and the Gospell*; *famous Papists* to their owne shame, yeeld that *Divine faith cannot be produced by Miracles.* *Andradius* saith often they may be false. *Maldonatus* saith, *That no necessary argument of faith can be drawn from Miracles.* Gregorius de Valen. *saith, Miracles give us no infallible certainty*

We know no extraordinary conversion by Miracles without the Word.

Andrad. defens. fidei, Trid. l. 2. *p.* 239. *falsa sunt hæc plerunque, plerunque infirma etiam Ecclesiæ veræ judicia.*

Maldonat. in Mat. 7. *v.* 22.

Greg. de Valen. tom. 3. *dis.* 1. *p.* 4. *sect.* 3.

certainty of Doctrine. Bellarmine saith, *Miracles cannot convince the minde. Durandus* giveth a sure reason why miracles cannot produce faith; *Because* (saith he) *suppose it were known of it self, that this miracle of the raising* e. g. *of Lazarus were true, yet it is not known by it self, that it testifieth that this is a true Doctrine which he preacheth who worketh the miracle.* Mr. *Prynne* then hath put the salvation of those who never heard the Gospel upon extraordinary Pillars, when he bottometh them on miracles without the word, which are extraordinary rotten Pillars.

Bellarm. de lib. arb. lib. 6. cap. 1. *Durandus* quest. 1. in Prolegom. Sent. Sect. 46.

5. The Lords Supper, of which we now dispute, is not the mean of our first conversion, *from formall profession, to inward embracing the Gospel:* For the word must go before, and not simply the externall letter of the word; but the word first believed and received by the efficacious working of the holy Ghost: And so the word is indeed the first converting Ordinance; and so the Lords Supper is given to one who already believes, and the Sacrament concurreth as a mean to make good, corroborate, and increase the conversion which was before. Mr. *Prynne* might have spared his pains in proving, That *the Lords Supper is a converting Ordinance, because it applieth Christ to us:* we grant it to be a converting, and quickning, and lively applicatory Ordinance: But how? He may know that whatever Ordinance addeth a new degree of Faith of conversion, of saving application of Christ and the Promises, must be a converting Ordinance: But it is so converting that it is a confirming Ordinance, and necessarily it presupposeth Faith and conversion already wrought by the word; it is not a first-converting Ordinance, such as is the word; but as nourishing or accretion is a sort of vitall generation in the body of a growing childe, so as Physicians make nutrition in children to be Aggeneration, or, Congeneration, or a vitall generation with, or in the body, and it presupposeth the first generation, by which life is given to the childe; now nourishing doth not give life, things void of life are not capable of nourishing; therefore nourishing is the continuing of life, and as it were prorogated and continued generation: so here, Sacramentall eating by faith, is a spirituall feeding and nourishing of the soul on the crucified Lords body broken, & his blood shed, it is not the act of our first conversion: Regeneration is sealed in Baptisme, and Christ given as sealing and confirming Regeneration; but the Lords Supper is

The Sacrament of the Supper not a first converting ordinance; yet a confirming one it is.

The Lords Supper presupposeth faith and conversion in the worthy receiver in Church-profession.

that which exhibiteth Christ to us as food,and sealeth our spirituall growing and coalition in Christ: I say not this, as if the Church could give the Supper of the Lord to none but such as are inwardly and really Regenerated,but to shew that the Church taketh such as are externally called,to be internally called when they dispense this Supper to them; & that they are nearer Christ then those that hear the Gospel(which Heathen may do)ere they can be admitted to the Supper. And this *Erast.* every where,and Mr. *Pryn,in terminis* teach when they say; That *those that are* recte instituti, *rightly instructed, who earnestly desire the Lords Supper, professe sincere Repentance, and promise amendment, are only to be admitted to the Sacrament, and those only excluded who are convicted to be grosse and scandalous, and obstinate offenders.* Whence it is clear they professe Repentance,and to the Church they are converts, who are to be admitted to the Supper before they come to the Lords Supper: Now this must be done by the word Preached, and received by faith in profession; *Ergo,* this Supper in the Church-way, cannot be dreamt to be a mean of their first conversion, far lesse *in foro Dei,* in Gods court, can men first receive the Lords Supper having never heard the word, and then be converted *in foro Dei,* really and inwardly, by receiving the Lords Supper; then might the Sacrament,before and without the word, be given, if it be a converting Ordinance belonging to all to whom the word belongeth: For Mr. *Prynne* saith, *It can be denyed to none within the visible Church.* And what reason, if it be no lesse the first converting Ordinance, but that it may be administred to those that never heard the word, and are Members of the visible Church? And by this Mr. *Prynne* cannot deny, but the Lords Supper should be dispensed to infants and children, who cannot try themselves, nor yet discern the Lords Body: Yea, those that are convicted of obstinacy in scandalous sins, are Members of the Church; for how could they be judged, convicted and sentenced, *if they be not within*? 1 Cor. 5. 12. *Ergo,* their being Members of the Church, is not enough to admit them to the Lords Supper,except they be to the Church otherwise qualified and fitted for it. And this doth clearly evidence, That the word of the Kingdom may, & ought to be Preached to many within the Church,that they may be converted to whom the Supper is not to be dispensed, that they may be cõverted,which is enough for our point to exclude.

Vindicat. pag 2.3.

pro-

promiscuous admission of all to the Supper; and to prove some other qualification must be requisite, in those that come to the Supper before the Ministers, (without violation of the holy things of God, and being guilty of not distributing aright) can administer the Supper to them: and this is another visible qualification then is requisite in those that hear the word: For *Erastus* and Mr. *Prynne* require, That all that come to the Supper *be rightly instructed*. 2. *That they promise amendment of life*: But they cannot say, none are to be admitted to hear the word, while they be qualified thus; you exclude the ignorant from the Sacrament, do you exclude the ignorant from hearing the word? Farther, I desire to be resolved, why *Erastus* and his require any qualification at all in the one, more then in the other, according to their way: For suppose persons Baptized be only negatively blameless, and not visibly scandalous; yet *Erastus* and Mr. *Prynne* cannot deny the Supper to such. Suppose they know not whether they be as ignorant of God as Indians, and suppose they promise no amendment, and do positively professe no repentance at all: 1. Ministers can deny no converting Ordinances to persons, because ignorant; for if the Supper of the Lord be a converting Ordinance, it shall convert men from their ignorance; and an Indian ignorant of Christ, ought to be Baptized, to the end, that Baptisme may convert him from his ignorance. Now I think our Brethren cannot say this, and therefore they must yield, that Ministers dare not admit all within the Church to the Seals, except they would be guilty of their sin, in eating to themselves damnation; and yet they dare not debar the ignorant within the Church from hearing the word, and so are no way compartners with them in the sin of unprofitable hearing. 2. Mr. *Prynne* may here see some ignorants debarred from the Lords Supper; yet I hope he would not be so rigid as to Excommunicate all ignorants, because ignorant: the most rigid *Novatians* would condemne that: and here is sole suspension without Excommunication, which Mr. *Prynne* saith is not to be found in all the word of God.

I wondred much when I read those words of the learned and reverend Master *Prynne*: *That God, who bestoweth no Ordinances on men in vaine, must intend in instituting the Supper, that visible morall unregenerate Christians, may be converted thereby, as well as reall Saints be confirmed*: to which I reply: 1. Neither word nor Sacra- Vindicat. page 43.

Sacraments, nor any thing on the part of the Almighty can be intended in vaine, though the end of the Ordinance be not obtained, I should have expected some such divinity from the pen of Arminians and Socinians, who make God to intend the salvation of all, and every one in both the promises of the Gospel, precepts and Sacraments, and yet he falleth from this end: so you may read, in *Arminius Anti-Perkins*, pag. 60. that God is disappointed in his end, in both Law and Gospel, and God shooting beside his mark missetb the salvation of many, say the Remonstrants at the Synod of *Dort*, *pag.*216. and in their confession, *c.7. sect.3.* and because *Socinus* thought it hard thus to take from God wise intentions; he did no lesse then blasphemously deprive him of his omniscience: So *Socians contra pucc.*, c.10. and in *prælectionib. Theolog.* c.11. *made all things that are contingently to come, uncertaine to God*: But if you speak of *intentio operis, non operantis*, that the Supper, in its nature, is ordained (this may rather be your meaning) that morall men like *Cicero*, and *Seneca*, and *Judas*, and the like, (for all are alike in regard of the nature of the ordinances, and of that which is the genuine intention not of God, but of this Sacrament) then you speak not of the supper as divided from the word, but as the word going before the Sacrament hath converted the man, and the Sacrament following doth adde to and confirme in grace. So, Sir, you depart from the question, for we grant that the Sermon going before in the same day of the celebration of the Supper, may, and doth convert; and thus if an Indian heare a Sermon, to which the celebration of the Supper is annexed, if he be converted by that Sermon (as you teach the heart in those, is only knowne to God, the Church is not to judge) he may forthwith, ere he be baptised, come at the same time to the Lords supper, which were much precipitation, little speed, and so the word formally converteth, not the Sacrament; But if you mean that the Sacrament formally, as the Sacrament is of its nature a mean of converting a morall *Seneca*, you mistake the nature of the seal, very farre, God never intended that food as food should give life to the dead, the Supper as the Supper is spirituall food, and presupposeth the eater hath life, and how gate he life but by the word of God? 2. Doth the Sacrament as the Sacrament humble or speak one word of the Law? doth the Sacrament say any thing here, but Christ died for thee, *O Seneca*, and

and there is a pledge of his love in dying for thee; and the like it speaketh to Iudas, as Master *Prinne* thinketh, and can this convert a morall man never yet humbled for sinne? But I have gone thus out of the way in this purpose, I returne and desire pardon for this digression, not (I hope) fruitlesse at this time.

If the Magistrate be the chiefe Church-officer, how is it that the Church was without Christian Magistrates in the Apostles time? then is there no exact paterne of a Christian Church, what it should be, *de jure?* hath Christ in the New Testament not moulded the Church, the second temple in all the dimensions of it, as *Moses*, *David*, *Solomon*, did by immediate inspiration shew us the measure of the first Tabernacle, Sanctuary, and Temple? finally should *Cesar*, suppose he had been a Christian, have received imposition of hands from the Elders, as his deputies the Ministers do? and be over the Church in the Lord as King? and receive accusations against Elders, ordaine Elders in every Church, put out and cast out the unworthy? only for the iniquity of the time, Ministers were forced to do these? *Erastus* and his have not one word of Scripture for this, or were the keys of the Kingdome of heaven given to *Cesar*? and because *Cesar* was without the Church, therefore *Peter* received them, *Matth.* 16. while *Cesar* should be converted, what Scripture have we for this? for to rule the Church as the Magistrate doth, is an act of the Magistrate performed by power of the sword: Whether the Magistrate do rule in his owne person, or by his deputies and servants; *Ergo*, the Apostles governing the Church medled with the sword, which Christ forbade, *Luk.* 22. 25, 26. *Rom.* 13. 4. *Luk.* 12. 13 14. and all the Pastors and teachers now in the exercise of discipline do usurpe the sword; Yea, if they be the deputies of the Magistrate in dispensing word and Sacraments, they must use the Magistrates sword as Ministers of the Gospel; for what servants do in the name of the supream swordbearer, that the swordbearer must principally do by the servants, so Ministers by this use both swords.

5. That the Magistrate cannot be the chief officer of the Church is thus proved, he who is subject himself to heare the Church, and to submit to those that watcheth for his soul, and to be put out from amongst the midst of the Church; if he be scandalous, is not the principall Governour and head of the Church to command all: Arg. 5.

But

But all Christians, and so the Christian Magistrate is such, for if God accept not the persons of men, those places, *Matth.*18. *If he hear not the Church,* &c. *Heb.*13.17. and 1 *Cor.* 5. 1, 2, 4, 12, 13. must tye the Christian Magistrate, except God have excepted him; but God hath no where excepted the Magistrate, But as *David* had *Gad*, *Nathan* and other Seers; so the Magistrates now have some to watch for their souls. The proposition is proved, because if the Magistrate be supream to command Elders as Elders, both in Doctrine and discipline, and in all Ecclesiasticall censures, then the Magistrate as the Magistrate cannot be under the Elders and Ministers as such, for that involveth a contradiction; that Pastors as Pastors should watch over the souls of Magistrates that they erre not, and oppresse not in judgement, and that the Magistrate as Magistrate should be over the souls of Pastors to watch for them in the same kind; if any object that the Pastors as Pastors have souls, and therefore they must have some to watch for their souls; and therefore can neither be supream, nor excepted in those places, *Mat.*18. *Heb.*13. 1 *Cor.*5. It is answered by granting all of this or this single Pastor, but not of the whole company; for when they erre, we know not a whole communitie over them, but those of the Catholick visible Church; and if they erre, the Kings of the earth here may command them to do their duty under paine of bodily censure, and punish them: But none are above them to watch for their souls, that we know; but they by office, watch both for their owne souls, and for the souls of others, even as the King governeth himselfe and the people both politically.

The Magistrate subject to the Church.

Argum. 6. 6. Whatever power in matters of Christs Kingdome or the Government thereof, the Magistrate hath, that must be given of Christ, who only can appoint Elders and officers over his owne house, but no where in Scripture find we any such power given to the Magistrate; *Ergo*, we are to beleeve he hath not any such power. The proposition is true, because Christ being a perfect Lawgiver and King, doth give Lawes for his owne house, as particularly as *Moses* did for every severall pinne in the Lords Tabernacle, and *David* and *Solomon* for the Temple: the assumption I prove; because the Government of Christs house is spirituall, as the weapons of their warfare are not carnall, 2 *Cor.*8.5. and it is in binding and loosing, forgiving and retaining sinnes, by the power of the keys of the Kingdome

Kingdome of God given to the Church, and to such as are sent, as *the Father sent his Son Christ*, Matth. 18.18. & 16.19. Ioh. 20. 21, 22, &c. But Magistrates as Magistrates do punish sinnes with the sword, *Rom.* 13. 4. but not forgive sins, nor binde and loose in earth or heaven, nor exercise any spirituall power, nor deal with the consciences of men, no more then they cure the diseases of the body, though indirectly and externally they take care that there be Physicians who can cure diseases.

The power of governing the Church is the supream power under Christ, which can say to the Magistrates power, *We must obey God, rather then men*: But no such supream power agreeth to the Magistrate as Magistrate: For Ministers as Ambassadors of Christ, can and may preach, binde and loose, Rebuke, Excommunicate against the will of the Magistrate, though he command the contrary, as Prophets have rebuked Kings, *Jer.* 1.18. & 22. 1, 2. 2 *Sam.* 12. 7,8,9. 1 *King.* 21. 18, 19. *Mark* 6. 17, 18. The Magistrate as the Magistrate can do none of these: nor hath he power to command the Ministers of Christ by way of privation; but only by way of accumulation he may command them to do their dury, and to preach the Gospel soundly, and forbid and punish the preaching of false Doctrine the same way.

Arg. 8. The church a perfect society without the Magistrate.

Whatever power Christ hath given to his Church, that the Christian Magistrate, when he becomes Christian, cannot take from the Church: But Christ gave to the Churches of *Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, to the seven Churches of Asia, &c.* a full power to dispense the word and Sacraments, to govern the Churches, to censure Wolves and false Teachers, who *draw Disciples after them*, in Synods to condemne *perverters of Soules*, and refute their Doctrine, to put out incestuous persons, to Excommunicate such as *will not hear the Church*, and a power to reject a *Heretick after twice admonition*, and *to rule well the Church*, as *they should rule their own house*, and *to rule well, and to labour in the Word and Doctrine, &c.* when they had no Magistrates at all to rule and govern them as a Church. Now if the Church be a perfect visible body, society, house, city, and Kingdom of Jesus Christ, *in esse & operari*, in *being and all Church-operations*; then the Magistrate, when he cometh to be Christian, to help and nourish the Church, as a father he cannot take away and pull the keys out of the hands of the stewards, and

throw the rod, authority, power to rule, govern, binde, loose, convene in Christs courts and Assemblies from the Church, and inthrall the Church: This evidenceth how falsely some say, *That the Church as the Church is Without a Magistrate, as an Army Without a Commander or Leader, a Ship Without a Pilot, a body Without a head.* Vtenbogard. When the Church in the Apostles times wanting a Magistrate, was a perfect spirituall body, gathered, edified, attaining to the unity of faith, *Eph.* 4. 11, 12, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Rom.* 12. 4, 5, *&c. Builded upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*, Eph. 2. 20. Feed by their own Pastors, *Act.* 20. 28. Sufficiently secured by *Jesus Christ from Wolves*, 29. 30. *Golden Candlesticks* perfect and intire, Christ walking in the midst of them, and praised and commended of Christ, *Rev.* 1. 20. & 2. 1, 2, 3. ver. 8, 9, 10. cap. 3. 8, 9, 10. Coming behinde in no gift, 1 *Cor.* 1. 7. In Covenant with God, casting out the incestuous, 1 *Cor.* 5. *Separated from Idols*, 2 Cor. 6. 16, 17, 18. *Espoused to one husband Christ*, 2 Cor. 11. 2. *Established in the faith, and increasing in number daily*, Act. 16. 5. *Yea, the Churches had rest throughout all Judea, and Galile, and Samaria, and Were edified, walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comforts of the holy Ghost, and Were multiplied*, Act. 9. 31. Now if the Christian Magistrate be their only Head and chief Feeder, and all Elders but his servants, Edifying *à & sub Magistratu, from and under the Magistrate:* How were they edified, and the compleat house of God, the house wanting a head, and *the Church of the living God*, without the chief feeder and shepheard the Magistrate, when all this time the Lord set spirituall Pastors and watchmen over them? It is true, it might be some defect, that they wanted a Christian Magistrate, who was their Nurse-father and keeper, and avenger of both Tables of the Law: But this defect was 1. A defect of the Church, as men who may be injured, and do violence one to another as men, if they want one who beareth the sword to be avenged on evil doers: But it is no defect of the Church as the Church. 2. There might be some defect in the Church as a Church, in this regard, that without the Magistrate his accumulative power, the edification of the Church extrinsecally might be slower, Church Laws lesse vigorous extrinsecally without the sword, and evil doers might infest the Church more; but there should be no privation or intrinsecall defect, or want in the Church, either of an officer, or integrall part of the Church,

Church, because they wanted the Magistrate. 3. When the first three hundreth year, the Churches wanted Christian Magistrates; afterward *Constantinus* convocated the Councell of *Nice* against *Arrius*, yet professing that he was *Episcopus*, without. After him the Empire being divided into three, *Constantinus*, *Constantius*, and *Constans*, the second adhered to *Arrius* & oppressed the godly. *Constans* and *Constantinus* lived not long: Though *Jovianus*, *Theodosius*, elder & yonger, *Gratianus*, *Martianus*, were favourers of the Church, yet most of the Northern Kings were persecuters. In the sixth hundreth year, they began to be obstinate favourers of Heresie. In the West *Antichristianisme*, in the East *Mahumetisme* rose; for the most part the Church wanted godly Magistrates, and alway hath wanted.

ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐντὸς ἦν. *Eusebius*, de vita constant. l. 4. c. 24. *Hyeronimus* in chron. an. 366. *Genebrard.* in liberio. *Niceph.* l. 4. c. 24. *Socr.* l. 3. c. 21. *Hyeronim.* chron. an. 367. *Barron.* an. 366. Arg. 9.

Whatever power or means of life Christ hath given to his Church or pastors for the edifying of their soules, either in Doctrine or Discipline; by these is the holy Ghost efficacious on the hearts and conscience of the people of God, as immediatly given by Iesus Christ, without the mediation or intervention of any other means. But Christ hath given power and means of life to preach the word, to admonish, rebuke, Excommunicate to the Church and Pastors, by which the holy Ghost worketh efficaciously on the hearts of the people of God, which God hath given immediatly to the Church and Pastors, especially in the Apostolick Church, when there were no Magistrates; and the holy Ghost is no wayes efficacious in the hearts of the children of God, by the Laws, Statutes, and sword of the Magistrate; *Ergo*, God hath given to his *Church* and Pastors, & not to the Magistrate, power and means of life, in which the holy Ghost is effectuall, and that immediatly and not to the Magistrate. Or thus: Whoever is the supream officer and head of the *Church*, having under him all *Church-officers* as his servants, by such God is effectuall in the consciences of men: But Pastors, Teachers, Elders are such, and no wayes the Magistrate: *Ergo*,

The Proposition is thus made good by the word of reconciliation, and the rod of the Lords power in the hands of men: The holy Ghost worketh efficaciously in men: Now the question will only be, to whom this word of reconciliation is committed, and the rod of God; the Scripture saith to the Ministers, never to the Magistrate, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18. *And hath committed to us the word of Reconciliation*, ver. 20. *Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8.

Though I should boast somewhat more of our Authority which the Lord hath given us for edification, 2 *Cor.* 2. 13. *If I come again I will not spare*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 21. *What will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love?* 1 Tim. 5. 17. Act. 20. 28. 29. 30. 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. *Do not you judge them that are within?* Matth. 16. 19, & 18. 18. Ioh. 20. 21, 22. This word is no where committed to the Magistaate, nor is the holy Ghost efficacious by the Laws and sword of the Magistrate to convert souls; we know not Magistrates to be *Ministers by whom we believe*, but Ministers only, 1 *Cor.* 3. ver. 5. Nor is the sword a kindely and intrinsecall mean of conversion. This Argument may be further confirmed by all the notable differences that the Scripture holdeth forth to be between the Magistrate and the Ministers and *Church*: As 1. The *Church* judgeth only those that are within the *Church*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11, 12. The heathen Magistrate may judge both those that are within and without the *Church*, and every soul is under his power, *Rom.* 13. 1,2,3. *Tit.* 3. 1,2. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1,2,3. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13,14,15. *Matth.* 22. 21. And by these same Scriptures, the Christian Magistrate being a lawfull Magistrate, having under him both believers and heathen, may and ought to judge both; *Ergo*, the Magistrate as the Magistrate cannot judge those that are within, by the word as the *Church* doth, but only in some common coactive way, by the sword, to compell them to do their duty. 3. The Magistrates Kingdom is of this world, and he may fight with his sword to defend his own subjects, and his subjects may fight for him: But the *Church* and Kingdom of *Christ*, are not of this world, nor can the *Church* as the *Church*, and the Ministers thereof fight or use the sword, as is clear, *Joh.* 18. 36. *Rom.* 13. 4. *The Magistrate beareth not the Sword in vain*: but he beareth the sword in vain over the consciences of men, or to judge those that are within; for the Church judgeth those that are within, with no such weapon as the bloody Sword; There is neither sword nor dagger, nor any weapon of War required in the *Church* of *Ephesus*, their censuring of grievous Wolves or false Teachers, *Act.* 20. 28, &c. Nor in the Apostles ahd Elders determining truth against perverters of souls, *Act.* 15. 21, 22, &c. and 16. 4. Nor in the Church of *Thyatira*, their not suffering *Jezabell* to teach, *Rev.* 2. 20. Nor in *Pergamus*, their not *suffering those that held the Doctrine of Balaam*, Rev. 2. 14. *Erastus* l. 4. c. 6. p. 285.

Differences between the Magistrate and Ministers of the Gospel and Church.

saith,

saith, *The Church can kill no man With the Sword.* There was no sword ever dreamt of in rejecting an heretick after the first and second admonition, *Tit.* 1. 10. Let our Adversaries shew what influence the Magistrates sword hath here: yea, (say they) *The Magistrate may banish the heretick out of the Church.* True.

Ans. Not out of the *Church* as the *Church*, but out from amongst his subjects as his subjects, whom he is to defend in peace and godlinesse. 2. It is evident *Titus* had no power of the sword, but was an Evangelist: *Paul* wrote not to *Titus* to banish the heretick, the rejecting here is a spirituall censure performed by previous admonitions. 3. What can the Magistrate as the Magistrate do to this? 4. The Magistrate is a Lord, and hath by Gods appointment a Lordly dominion over those that are under him; the Minister is only a Minister, a Servant, a Preco, or Herald, and hath no dominion in the *Church*, Luk. 22. 24, *&c.* Now those over whom the Magistrate hath a civill dominion as a Magistrate, over those he may exercise that Lordly dominion of the sword: But the Magistrate as the Magistrate, may use no Lordly dominion of the sword over the *Church* as the *Church*, to Preach, Exhort, Rebuke, Admonish, Excommunicate, to judge those that are within, as the *Church* may do, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. *Ergo*, the Magistrate as the Magistrate, cannot be the supream and highest Church officer, having under him Church officers, as his servants and deputies to Preach and censure as, *à & sub*, under and from him, because as a Magistrate he carrieth not that which hath any power over the conscience, that is, he carrieth not the *word of the spirit*, as a Magistrate, but the sword bodily to punish evil doers. 5. He who by office is chief overseer and watchman in the Church, he must by office keep *his own vineyard, and not be put to keep the vineyard of others*, Cant. 1. 6. *He must watch for the souls of those, whom by office he keepeth as one that must give an accompt*, Heb. 13. 17. He must as a speciall watchman by his office, *Take heed to grievous Wolves not sparing the Flock, speaking perverse things*, Act. 20. 29. And, as a watchman he must *blow the Trumpet*, and give early and seasonable warning to the people of the sword, *Ezek.* 34. 1, *&c.* Yea, he must watch for the souls of ministers and teachers, and by office, rebuke, admonish, censure, and punish them, and by office judge of their Doctrine and Discipline, and is over the people in the Lord, and to admonish them, as

1 *Thes.*

1 *Thes.* 5. *And worthy of Honour for well Ruling*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. But these the Magistrate as the Magistrate cannot do. 1. He keepeth another vineyard of the Civill state, he is not Pastor to the Church as the Church, over which the Holy Ghost hath set him, *Act.* 20. 28. 1 *Peter* 5. 1, 2, 3. he is not to give an accompt for the souls, and for the souls of Pastors by his office, he may as a Christian be his brothers keeper, to teach, admonish, *Col.* 3. 15. and exhort, *Heb.* 3. 13. he is not by office to blow the trumpet, as *Ezekiel* was, *Ezek.* 33. 7, 8. *Ezek.* 3. 17, 18, 19, 20. he is not over the people in the Lord to admonish them as a Magistrate, as a Magistrate he only is either to praise and reward well doing, or take vengence on evill doing, *Rom.* 13. 4. nor doth *Paul* think *Nero*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *worthy of double honour*, all those are proper to Church-officers, the proposition is necessary; because if the Magistrate be the eminent and supream watchman over the Pastors, as his under deputies and servants, then must the Magistrate more eminently keepe the vineyard, and watch for the souls, both of Pastors and people, *feed the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath set him, be over the people in the Lord, be worthy of double honour, as one that ruleth well, and is worthy of double honour*; and that by office: Now 1. The word never warranted him in the Old Testament, *to sacrifice, to burne incense to Minister before the Lord, to carry the ark*: But God separated the Priests and Levites for this only; and was it such a sinne for *Uzziah* to burne incense; and for *Uzziah* to touch the Ark, and for any to bear the Ark but the Levites? and are not these things written for our instruction? are we all now to bear the Ark? and are we all to dispense the word and Sacraments? When *Paul* will not have women to teach in the Church, and when God hath no lesse in the New Testament separated some by the laying on of hands, and appointed a Ministery in the New Testament then he did in the Old? 2. Where hath God in Old or New Testament set downe, that all those qualifications, in an eminent manner, and as principally due to the Magistrate, as he hath described the qualification of the officers of the New Testament in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the *Ephesians*, *Ch.* 4. *v.* 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1 *Cor.* 12. *Rom.* 12. 3. Did Christ put upon Church-officers in the New Testament, all the proper titles, priviledges and peculiar Characters of their calling, as they are the deputies of *Claudius*, *Tiberius*,

Tiberius, and *Nero*; so they had been Christian Princes? this the adversaries must prove, and must all the Epistles of *Paul* to the Churches of Christ, and of *Iames* and *Peter*, *John* and *Iude*, which concern Church-officers be written: First and principally to the heathen Emperours, as they be Church-Magistrates, and Church-officers *jure*, though they be in very deed enemies of the Gospel, *de facto*? It must put *Erastus* and all his to paines to prove, that Magistrates as Magistrates were separated in the Old Testament to sacrifice, to burne incense, to bear the Ark of the Lord, and Priests and Levites, and Prophets, were only the under servants and instruments of Kings, and the like they must do in the New Testament: But this is carefully to be observed; that the adversaries, though they speake of Government, and some yield, as Master *Prynne* doth, that there is such a thing as Excommunication, especially, 1 *Cor.*5. yet the truth is, they deny all Church-government: for I desire to know, why they give to Ministers of the Gospel a power to try who are hereticks, apostates, and unworthy partakers of the holy things of God; Yea, such as may ordaine Ministers, and reject hereticks after admonitions; if Iesus Christ hath given this power of Government beside preaching the word, I aske, *quo jure*, by what Scripture, if by no warrant of Christ: then it is unjustly given to them, and the Apostles and Teachers then had no right to it; if there be a right, that by office Pastors should know what is soundnesse in the faith, and integrity of conversation; and so who are to be called to the Ministery, who not, who are to be excluded totally from the Church, as *Erastus* and Master *Prynne* say, who not; Then what warrant hath the Magistrate to limit the Ministers of the Gospel in this Government, such as it is, more then in dispensing the word and Sacraments? Surely except the Magistrate put his hand to the Arke without warrant in the one, he cannot in the other. They answer, *the Magistrate may limit the Pastors in preaching, no lesse then governing, because he may command the Pastor to preach this and this, and if he preach not sound Doctrine, he may punish him*; but I answer, this is no limitting of Pastors in preaching; Because this the Pastors may in the name and authority of God, exhort the Magistrate to execute righteous judgement, *Ier.*22. and if he crush the poor and needy, and turne a tyrant, an heretick and an apostate, the Pastors may not only denounce wrath from

The Magistrate cannot limit the pastors in the exercise of his calling.

See Henr. Salcobrig. *in* Becano. Bac p. 140. *Ait regem esse primatam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ,* and *reges sacro olco uncti capaces sunt spiritualis jurisdictionis, Rex propria autorite creat. Episcopus.* See Cald. *in altar.* Dam. *p.* 14, 15, 16. *seq.*

That Magistrates are more hot against punishing of sin by the Church, then against sinfull omissions, which argueth that they are unpatient of Christs yoak, rather then that they desire to vindicate the liberty of the subject in this point.

from the Lord against them, but also judge them dogs and swine, and not dispense to them the pearls of the Gospel, yet this is not the Pastor limiting the Magistrate as the Magistrate doth limit the Pastor, as his Ambassadour and Deputie, though the Magistrate take care that Physitians, Painters, Shoomakers, Professors in Academies and Vniversities doe their dutie in their calling, and punish them, if they therein doe amisse, yet he limiteth not the painter to draw this way, not this way, nor hath he a negative voyce in acts of Art, as he pretendeth a negative voyce in Church-discipline. 2. Nor can the Pastor so command the Magistrate in the name of God, to execute justice, as if he become a tyrant, an heretick, an apostate, he will not only remove him from the Throne, and the Bench, but he will set himselfe downe in the place of the erring Magistrate, and judge righteous judgement for him, or in his place: for *Erastus* saith that the Magistrate may dispence word and Sacraments (if he had time and leasure) as lawfully as the Pastor; and I have in another place observed, that many so make the King head of the Church (and the like must be said of the little heads of inferior Magistrates, as of the great head) as he is a mixed person, partly Civill, partly Ecclesiasticall and sacred, that is, by office, Ruler and Pope. 3. The Magistrate doth limit the Pastors only in positives, and in punishing and inflicting Church censures, as they command to censure scandalous persons in such and such scandals, but in no other scandals more hainous; yet in all the challenges moved by Magistrates against Pastors, The Magistrate never made any challenge against Pastors or Synod, for their sinfull omissions and want of zeal in not censuring drunkards, adulterers, hereticks, court parasites, who injoy many benefices, and leave the flock, and I give instance, in the disputes of the Divines of *England* making the King the head of the Church; court-divines accused never the Pastors that they exceeded their limits in not censuring corrupt Prelates, non-residents, pluralists, idle and unpreaching Pastors, or idol-shepherds. 4. In the contests of *Holland*, when the Synod of *Frizland* gave in a declinature to the Senate, justifying the deposition of *Poppius* an unsound and scandalous Minister, in all contests with Arminians there, the controversie was ever for positives, that the Church condemned and censured hereticks, never that the Church had been slack in the matter of discipline. 5. In *Scotland* in Master

Blackes

Blackes declinature, and when the Ministers condemned to death and then banished, such as the godly and zealous servants of Christ, Master *Iohn Welch*, Master *Iohn Forbes*, and others appealed to the assemblies of the Church, for their standing for the liberties of the Church and Kingdome of Christ. King *Iames* did never quarrell with them, *Thus you have not done in your Ministery, and Assemblies, you have not excommunicated the Marquesse of* Huntly *a bloody man*; but it was for positives, *Thus and thus you have done against the mind and Majestie of the King and Authority.* Now corrupt Pastors need as much to be limited in wicked omissions, as is clear: *You are dumbe dogs and barke not*, Isai. 56.10. *And the diseased ye have not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick*, &c. *Ezech.* 34.4. as in exorbitances, in their positive zeal; And this saith, that Magistrates intend to intrude upon Christs liberties, in this plea, rather then indeed to procure that the house of God may be builded and edified, or the liberty of the subject vindicated. And therefore the godly ought the rather to stand for the freedom of the Kingdome of the Lord Iesus, which owe not this tribute to earthly Princes; since Christ only is King, and raigneth in his owne Church.

CHAP. XXIV. Quest. 20.

Of the reprocation of the subordination of the Civill and Ecclesiasticall powers to each, and their supremacie and independencie each from other.

FOr the clearing of the question, I humbly offer these considerations to the Reader.

1. *There is subordination of the power, and a subordination of the person indued with the power, here to be considered.*

2. *So is there a supremacy of power, and a supremacy of the person.*

3. *There is a foure fold judgement here considerable*; 1. *The first is apprehensive* (apprehensivum) *and common to both Magistrate,*

Christian, Pastor, and all which must be given to all to whom we can ascribe conscience. 2. (Discretivum) *the knowledge of discretion, the connaturall guide and principle of every mans beliefe and obedience.* 3. (Definitivum) *of those that are in Authority, and do command in the Lord.* 4. Peremptorium et infallibile, *the supream judgement of the King of the Church, who cannot erre. The first is common to all,* Rom.15. *The second proper to Christians, and is a judgement of faith,* 1 Thess.5.2. 1 Ioh.4.1. *and it must be builded on the first. The third is the Authoritative judgement of the Church,* Act.15.28. Mat.18.17. *and of judges, and it must be swayed by the second, both in the commander and the commanded. The fourth is Iesus Christs only,* Rom.14.4. 1 Cor.4.5.

Not any power or office subject to any, but to God immediately, subjection is properly of persons,

4. *It is one thing, that the power of the Ministers be subject to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, and another thing that the persons of the Ministers should be subject:* Not any office at all in their power, seems to me to be subordinate to either Magistrate or Minister; because all Lawfull power, and Lawfull and profitable offices, and Arts, *in abstracto* are from God, some of them immediately; *As the the gift of propheſying, healing, speaking with tongues, working of miracles,* and the offices of Apostle, Evangelist, Pastor, and Teacher, *Ephe.*4.11. those be χαρίσματα, gifts and graces above Nature, that God without the interveening of human reason, hath devised for a supernaturall end, the edifying of his body the Church; mens will and reason may interveen in the designation of persons to some of those offices, as that *Iohn, Thomas,* qualified as 1 *Tim.*3. be Pastors, or teachers. But if we speak of the power of the Ministery, *in abstracto,* without connotation of the persons *in concerto*, then the power, or the office it selfe is not subordinate to the Ministers of the Gospel as Ministers; far lesse to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, because it dependeth upon none on earth, Minister or Magistrate; but the only good pleasure of him, *who when he ascended to heaven,* gave gifts unto men, that there is such an office as Minister, Pastor or teacher; And the Church cannot create a new office of a Prelate; because of its nature it tendeth to a supernaturall end, the governing of Christs body, in a way to life eternall, purchased by Christ: Now the question in this sense, *whether the power of the Ministery be subordinate to the Magistrate in its constitution, it is alike in its subordination to Magistrate and Minister*; certain it is

subordi-

subordinate to neither. Other lawfull and profitable offices and Arts are from God, mediately, possibly by the intervening acts of rationall nature, though Magistracy be from God, *Rom.* 13. 1. yet it would seeme, God by the naturall reason of men, might devise and constitute the very office of Magistracy *in abstracto*, and the Art of sayling, painting, *&c.* yet is there no subjection of power to power here, by way of dominion: Hence the question must be of the subordination of the power, *quoad exercitium*, whether Ministers in the exercising of their Ministeriall calling be subordinate to the Magistrate as the Magistrate?

5. Dist. *A judge is one thing, and a just judge another thing, so here are we to distinguish between a Magistrate, and a Christian Magistrate. As* 1. *a husband is one thing, and a Christian husband another thing*, a Captaine is one thing, and a Christian, and a beleeving Centurion or Captain, such as *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10. is another; a Physitian is one thing, and a gracious Physitian is another thing; sure a heathen Husband hath the same *jus Maritale*, the same Husband power in regard of Marriage union, that a Christian and beleeving Husband hath. 2. A Magistrate and a Christian Magistrate may be one and the same Magistrate, with one and the same Magistraticall power, as being first heathen Magistrate, as *Sergius Paulus*, *Act.* 13. 7, 12. and there after converted to the faith. *Paulus* was no lesse a civill Deputie, when Heathen then when Christian, and not more a Deputy as touching the essence of a Magistrate, when a Christian beleever, then he was before when a Heathen; yet to be a Magistrate, and to be a beleeving Magistrate, are two different things, even as Christianity is a noble ornament, and a gracious accident, and to be a Magistrate, is as it were the Subject, even as a man, and the accidents of the man, are two different things.

A Magistrate and a Christian different.

6. *There be two things here considerable in the Magistrates office.* 1. *There is his* jus *and* ἐξουσία *Magistraticall power, or the authority officiall, the power of office to beare the sword.* 2. *There is* aptitudo, δυναμις, *a speciall heavenly grace of well governing*; this is χαρισμα a gift or grace of God, to use that power for Christ. These two make one Christian husband, one Christian captain, Physitian, Master, in relation to to the wife, souldiers, sick, servants: Now the Magistrate heathen as Magistrate, even *Nero*, when the Church of God is in his

Two things in a Christian Magistrate, *jus authoritie, aptitudo, habilitie.*

court and dominions, hath the same *jus*, the same Authority and Officiall power, to be a keeper of both Tables of the Law, and to defend the Gospell, and to command the Preachers and Synods to fulfill their charge, and to see that the officers doe their dutie, and to punish *dumbe dogs, Idolaters, excommunicated persons*, to drive away with the sword false Teachers from the flock, he hath I say the same Magistraticall power, while he is a Heathen, and when he is converted to the Christian faith, and he is equally head of men that professe Christ, when *Heathenish* as when Christian; but in neither States, *is he the Head of the body the Church*, and you give not to *Cesar the things that are Cesars*, if you make converted *Nero*, because a Magistrate, now the *head of the Church*, and deny non-converted and heathenish *Nero* to be the *Head of the Church*; for he is a Magistrate with compleat power of the Sword, in the one case, as in the other, that he neither doth, nor can use the sword for the Church, it is from *Nero* his state of infidelity that he is in as a man, and not the fault of his office; for when *Paul* saith, *the Husband is the head of the Wife*; doth hee meane a Christian husband onely, and exclude all heathen Husbands? No, for then the wife were not to be subject to the Husband, if a Heathen and an unbeleever, which is against *Pauls* mind, 1 *Cor.* 7. and the Law of Nature. But the converted Magistrate, who was before a heathen Magistrate, hath a new aptitude, faculty and grace to keep both Tables of the Law, and to govern in a civill way, and indirectly the affaires of Christs Kingdome: Hence the adversaries clearly contradict themselves by confounding those two, a Magistrate and a Christian Magistrate, one while they give supream power over the Church to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, sometime to the Magistrate as Christian. So *Vtenbogard* in his book *De officio, & authoritate supremi Magistratus Christiani in rebus Ecclesiasticis* p.7. and p. 8. *hoc addo, ut intelligatur Magistratum, cum religionẽ Christianam amplectitur, non acquirere novam authoritatem, sed quod eam authoritatem, quam ante etiam in rebus religienis & cultus divini, habebat authoritatẽ, --rectè utitur*: If the Magistrate when he becommeth a Christian, acquireth no new authority as a Magistrate, but onely useth well his old Authority, in matters of Religion and of Gods worship, which he had before, while he was Heathen, as he saith, then the Heathen Magistrate as a

magi-

Magiſtrate hath a ſupreame power in Church matters, and yet in the ſame place he draweth the ſtate of the queſtion to a Chriſtian Magiſtrate. *De ſolo Chriſtiano Magiſtratu acturus.* The *Arminians* in their Apologie, *fol.* 297. (as ſaith their Declaration) ſpeake *onely of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate*, and yet *page* 298. *poteſtati enim ſupremæ, ſive Architectonicæ, qua poteſtas ſuprema eſt, jus hoc ut competat, ratio ordinis, ſive boni Regiminis, natura ſua poſtulat,---- ſi Magiſtratui qua tali jus hoc competit, ergo multo magis competit Magiſtratui Chriſtiano.* Sure, if the Magiſtrate, in generall, and as the Magiſtrate, have a ſupream Authority in the Government of the Church, ſuch as the Adverſaries contend for, then the Chriſtian Magiſtrate farre more muſt be Head of the Church, and ſo the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate muſt be ſupreame Governour, and judge in all Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, and in theſe ſame cauſes, he muſt not be Iudge as a Magiſtrate, but as a Chriſtian.

Nor can they make a Chriſtian Magiſtrate, *à medium per participationem utriuſque extremi*, a middle betweene a Magiſtrate and a Chriſtian. 1. For where is there ſuch an office in either Church or ſtate? for ſo a *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* as a *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* ſhould be *Ens per aggregationem*, a thing compoſed of Magiſtracy and Chriſtianity, as a *Chriſtian Phyſician*, a Chriſtian Painter; and then the queſtion ſhould be, whether judgeth he as a *Magiſtrate*, or as a Chriſtian? as we may aske whether a Chriſtian painter painteth as a painter or as a *Chriſtian*: not as a *Chriſtian*, for then all *Chriſtians* ſhould be *Painters*; and a reſult of both ſhould neither be a *Magiſtrate* nor a *Chriſtian*, but middle between both, which fighteth with reaſon and ſenſe. Some ſay, *The power of the Magiſtrate in a Chriſtian Magiſtrate who knoweth the doctrine of the Goſpell, and hath help of the counſell and light of godly Paſtors and Teachers, is perfecter then in Heathen Magiſtrates, and therefore this power as not Chriſtian or heatheniſh, governs men as men, but as Chriſtian, it governeth them as Chriſtian men.* But the learned and worthy profeſſor *Jac. Triglandius* ſaith this is ſaid without probation, for (ſaith he) men as Chriſtians are members of the Church, *and ſo are not governed but in an Eccleſiaſticall way, and where hath the Lord commanded the Chriſtian Magiſtrate to governe the ſheep of Chriſt, as the ſheep of Chriſt?* Then (ſay I) 1. The magiſtrate muſt governe the Church as the *Church*, and ſo rule over

Pareus Com. in Rom. 13. dub.

Iac. Triglandius de poteſt civ. & Eccleſiaſtica c. 10. 207, 208. Vbi nam injunxit Chriſtus Magiſtratui Chriſtiano ut oves Chriſti qua tales Regat.

over the conscience of men in relation to eternall happinesse, by promising to them temporall rewards, and by compelling them by the sword, to be carried toward eternall beatitude; for to rule the *Church* as the *Church*, is to direct and lead them by spirituall means, Word, Sacraments and Discipline, to heaven, which the magistrate as a magistrate cannot do by the sword; and what he doth as a Christian, that he must do in a spirituall way, not with a secular arm and power as magistrate; and the two powers of a magistrate and of a Christian, cannot *coalescere*, grow together in one office which is made up of both, as of two parts, being in nature and spece different, no more then of a Horse and a Lyon you can make a third living creature. It is true, by Grace and Christianity, the power of the magistrate is perfected, and an excellent lustre added to it, but not one degree of Magistraticall power is added to it, by which the magistrate doth rule men as Christians, and as a *Church*: For as the office of a magistrate doth not promote the man one step nearer to saving Grace; so Christianity maketh not the Heathen magistrate more a magistrate, nor giveth him a new sword over the *Church* as the *Church*, which he had not before; nor doth it take any magistraticall power from him, no more then a heathen Husband, Master, Physician, being converted to *Christ*, is more a husband, more a master or Physician, then he was before: The former power is only spiritualized, and graciously facilitated in its acts, but not one whit augmented in its entitative degrees of power over the wife, the souldiers, the servants, the sick. *Trigland.* excellently: *The Christian magistrate converted, is sanctified, but he acquireth no new right over the Church: So meat is sanctified by the Word and Prayer, but it is not more meat, nor doth more nourish*, beause sanctified.

Christianity maketh no new power of, or to Magistrates.

Fac. Trig. land. differ. Theo. de potest. civ. c.8.p.174.

7. Distinct. *The exercise of the Ministeriall power in dispensing Word, Sacraments, Discipline, falleth under a fourfold consideration, which, because it cleareth a necessary point, I desire may be carefully observed by the Reader:* 1. *The simple exercise of that power is considered* sine modo, *without any qualification, good or evil, Orthodox, or Heterodox, as the Christian Magistrate procureth by his care, that there should be a Ministery to dispense Word, Sacraments, and Discipline.* 2. *The second Consideration of this exercise, is, The exercise of power soundly and painfully, in the fear of the Lord, the Magistrate exhorting them thereunto for conscience.* 3. *The third Consi-*

A fourfold consideration of the exercise of Ministerial power most necessary, upon which & the former Distinctions, followeth ten very considerable Assertions.

deration

deration is the exercise of the same, in a corrupt and wicked way and manner, either negligently or wickedly, or for evil ends. 4. The fourth Consideration is the free and peaceable exercise of this power without bodily violence.

Hence I intreat the Reader to carry along in his eye, 1. The simple exercise of the Ministeriall power. 2. The just and godly, sound and laudable exercise. 3. The wicked and corrupt exercise, or the abuse thereof. 4. The peaceable exercise.

Hence, our 1. *Assertion:* The Magistrate as the Magistrate is to procure that there be Preachers and Church-officers to dispense Word, Sacraments, and Discipline: For 1. his end is, That people under him *may lead a quiet and a peaceable life in godlinesse and honesty*, 1 Tim. 2. 2. And the Magistrate attaineth his end as a Magistrate, if there be simple exercise of Religion in the quiet and peaceable way, that may consist with the subjects indempnity, and immunity, from rapine, injuries, and violence. 2. The difference between the Magistrates and other callings, is, that the Magistrate was to take care of old, That there were *Levites who bare the Ark*, and, *Priests who should burn incense before the Lord, and Sacrifice*; and yet it was unlawfull for the Magistrate *to bear the Ark* on his own shoulders, or in his own person *to burn incense or sacrifice*; so the Physicians hinder that diseases rage amongst the subjects, and the Magistrates do also hinder that they should rage: But the Physians hinder them by curing diseases, and the Magistrate hinders them not by curing diseases; for then he should as a Magistrate also be a Physician, but by procuring that there should be Physicians in the Common-wealth. The Magistrate hindreth ignorance, and losing Ships by Tempests, not by professing and teaching Sciences and Arts in Academies in his own person, nor by steering Ships, and guiding them himself to their Ports, for so a magistrate as a magistrate should be a Schoolmaster, a professor of Arts and Sciences in the Universities, and a Pilot or Shipmaster, which were a confounding of all callings; but by procuring that there should be Universities and Professors of Arts and Sciences, and by providing honorable stipends and wages for them, and procuring that in the Common-wealth there should be Sailers who are skilled in Shipping: and so doth the magistrate by his office take care, that the *Word, Sacraments and Discipline*, be dispensed. 3. But the magistrate as the magi- 1. Assert.

magistrate doth not command sincere, hearty, zealous, and affectionate dispensing of Word, Sacraments and Discipline: But only the dispensing of those without the qualification of the spirituall, or sincere exercise of the power; Because, 1. The Magistrate cannot command that as a magistrate, which he cannot judge of, whether the thing commanded be consonant to his command, or not: But the magistrate as the magistrate cannot judge of the spirituallity, sincerity, zealousnesse, affectionateneſſe of that obedience, which the Church yieldeth to his command: for if the Pastors dispense word and Sacraments, and binde and loose by the keys following the rules of the word; the magistrate cannot judge the heart or intention, whether they do those with conscience to God, and reverence and subjection of spirit to his holy Law, nor can the manner of doing be proved by witnesses to the magistrate. 2. The Magistrate as Magistrate doth not command what he doth not praise or reward, for well doing is the object of the Magistrates praising and rewarding power, *Rom.*13.3. But as a Magistrate he doth not praise and reward the qualification, or spirituality, or sincerity of Pastors dispensing of word and seals; if they feed the flock, the Magistrate is to take care they be rewarded with wages, nor can the Magistrate as the magistrate withhold praise or wages from labourers in the vineyard, because they preach Christ out of envy, as some did *Phil.* 1. 15. or because they feed not the lambs out of a love to Christ, as they ought to do, *Ioh.*21.15,16,17. it is true, magistrates as godly men, may love and commend sincerity in faithfull labourers, and hate the contrary; but this they do as Christian men, not as magistrates, not by their office, and authoritatively. 3. Magistrates command that as magistrates, the not doing of which they can as magistrates punish with the sword, for the object of their vindicative and revenging power is ill doing, *Rom.*13.4. But if Pastors feed the flock and rule them, the magistrate cannot use the sword against the feeders, for that they want sincerity, love, cheerfulnesse in the manner of doing these things, for the sword of the magistrate doth only reach men for their externall facts, not for opinions in the mind, not for crooked intentions, not for hollow-heartednesse, hypocrisie, infidelity in the manner, or inward principles of the actions.

The Magistrate as the Magistrate commandeth the exercise of Ministeriall power, but not the spirituall and sincere manner of the exercise.

II. Asser. when magistrates command Churchmen to do their duty,

duty, and to feed the flock, sincerely, and in the fear of the Lord, they do it not as magistrates; but as touching the manner, they may exhort them to do their duty sincerely, cordially, and zealously as godly men; hence that charge that King *Iehoshaphat* gave to the Priests and Levites, 2 *Chron.*19.9. *This shall ye do in the fear of the Lord faithfully, and with a perfect heart*, is a mixt command, as touching the judging of the people in all causes and controversies that should come before them; the King as King commanded them to do this: But for the manner of the doing of it, that they should do it *faithfully in the feare of the Lord, and with a perfect heart*; this he commanded them not as a King, but exhorted them to it, as a godly & religiousman:for 1.any godly man might have said this,and the King might have punished the Levites and Priests, if they had not judged the causes according to the Law. But though they had *not judged in the fear of the Lord, and with a perfect heart*; yet could not the King as King have punished them therefore, nor can any say, that the spirituall exhortation of *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* 29. to the Priests and Levites,came from him as King,but as from a graced and religious man; as King he might command them to Sanctifie themselves legally, for so they were to do by office; and he might use the sword against them, if they failed in that; and as King he may command all externall duties, not only to Church-men, but to all others; only he cannot punish them for failings in the spirituall manner of doing externall duties. 2. A spirituall and Christian exhortation *ex conditione operis*, and intrinsecally,hath influence on the conscience to turne the soul to God. But nothing that the magistrate can do as a magistrate, hath such an influence on the conscience, all that he doth as a magistrate and directly, is toward the outward man, by rewards and punishments; if the magistrate remove false teachers and wolves, which would devour the flock, and if that work upon the conscience, it is indirectly and by accident, for, *quoad actus imperatos*,he can command that the Gospel, which hath a kindly and intrinsecall power to work upon the conscience, be preached; if the magistrate convince the conscience of a murtherer, that he hath failed against the Law of God, he doth not that as a magistrate, but as a godly and religious man: he may convince him as a magistrate, that he hath failed against the Lawes of the State, and bands of humane society, and externall peace,

Magistrates as godly men, not as Magistrates command sincerity and zeal in the manner of the exercise of ministeriallpower.

and scarce that, for *ignorantia juris nemimem excusat.*

Obj. 1. *It may be objected against this: If the Elders not only omit to do their duty, but also if they erre in the nature and quality of what they do, the Magistrate is to punish*; Ergo, *the Magistrate not only commandeth the Church to do the externall facts, but also commands the facts with such and such qualities: the Antecedent is proved because the Magistrate not only punisheth the omission of a Church duty, as if Pastors preach not; but also if they preach not* tali modo, *Orthodox and sound Doctrine.*

Ans. We never denied but the Magistrate commandeth both the exercise of Church power simply, and the manner and such qualifications as are externall, and obvious to the knowledge of the Magistrate, such as blasphemous and false Doctrine is; But we deny that as a Magistrate he doth command those things that are internall and invisible, that is, the spirituallity of the actions; he can exhort and stirre men up to the spirituallity and sincerity of doing as a godly and Christian man.

Obj. 2. *The Pastors and guides of the Church as such, do only command externall obedience, for they can onely* in foro Ecclesiæ, *in the Court of the Church censure externall disobedience before men, the heart and sincerity thereof is no more obvious to the eye of Elders, then of Magistrates.*

Ans. 1. I deny the connexion of the Antecedent; for Elders may command as Elders, more then the not doing of which they can censure, which the Magistrate cannot do; for *Elders have committed to them the word of reconciliation, as the Ambassadors of Christ.* Now the word hath an immediate influence on the conscience, on the thoughts and intents of the heart, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 3. 5. 1 *Cor.* 4. 15. *Ps.* 19. 7. *Heb.* 4. 12, 13. And therefore their Ministery hath action on the thoughts; yet can they not in the externall court of the Church, censure the thoughts, as not being able to see them, but the Gospel which they preach can arraigne the conscience and thoughts, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. But the Magistrate carrieth not such a message, and therefore his Magistraticall command can reach no farther then his temporall praise and reward, and his sword; and that is commensurable and of equall latitude with those.

Obj. 3. *The Object of the Magistrates power, is well doing, and ill doing,*

doing, both civill, and also supernaturall; both for the first table, or as well for the spirituall acts of worship and Religion in the first table, as for acts of Iustice and mercy in the second table, Rom. 13. 3, 4. Isai. 49, 23. *and you said elsewhere, that externall peace is too narrow an object for the Magistrate, for the intrinsecall end of a Magistrate is also a supernaturall good, and not only a peaceable, but also a godly life,* 1 Tim. 2. 2.

Ans. It is true, the Magistrate as the Magistrate doth care for the supernaturall good of subjects, and the duties of Religion, and the first table, but how? intrinsecally and as a magistrate, that is, that men worship God according to his word: But, 1. The magistrate as such hath nothing to do with the spirit, nor can he command the sincerity of the worship; his care is that there be a divine worship, that is, materially and externally right and consonant, externally to the rules of the word; and for this cause learned divines make the externall man the object of the magistrates office; but not the externall man as doing the duties of the second table only, but also as serving God in the duties of the first table: for which cause I said *Augustine* meant the same, *when he said, that Kings serve God as men and as Kings.* 2. Magistrates as magistrates are to extend their power for Christ; that is, that not only there be Iustice and Peace amongst men, but also that there be Religion in the land, yea, that the Gospel be preached; so all our Divines make the King to be *custos et vindex utriusque tabulæ*: Yea, I think he is a keeper and preserver of the Gospel also, and is to command men to serve Christ, and professe the Gospel, and to punish the blaspheming of Iesus Christ: and this is royall and magistraticall service that the King as King performeth to God, and to Iesus Christ the mediator, *ex conditione operis*, in regard that good which he procureth as King, materially and externally, is consonant to the supernaturall Law of the Gospel, but it is not magistraticall service to Christ *ex intentione operantis.*

Augustin. *contr. literas petilian. l. 2. c. 92. & contr.* Cresconi. l. 8. c. 5. *reges serviunt Deo in quantum sunt homines, & in quantum sunt reges.*

Obj. 4. *When its required that the Magistrates be men fearing God, hating coveteousnesse, &c. is not this an essentiall ingredient of an King as a King, that he read in the book of the Law, that he may feare God,* Deut. 17?

Exo. 18. 21 Deu. 1. 16. 17. Deu. 17. 19 20.

Ans. There is a twofold goodnesse here to be considered, one of the magistrate as a magistrate, another as a good and Christian

magistrate. The former is an officiall goodnesse, or a magistraticall prudence, justice, and goodnesse; this is required of all magistrates as such, to judge the people: so the acts of an heathen magistrate done according to common naturall equity, by *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Pilate*, *Cesar*, *Felix*, *Festus*, are to be acknowledged as acts of a Lawfull Magistrate, valide and no lesse essentially Magistraticall, then if performed by King *David*; and of this goodnesse the Scriptures speak not as essentiall to a Magistrate as a Magistrate: But there is another goodnesse required of Magistrates as they are Members of the Iewish Church, and as they are Christians, and of these the Scripture speaketh; and so Magistrates not as Magistrates, but as good and Christian, are to be such as feare God, *hate covetousnesse, respect not the face and favour of men; so its denied that the fear of God, hating of covteousnesse, are essentiall ingredients of Kings as Kings:* For Kings as Kings intend justice, peace, godlinesse, materially considered, both *ex conditione operis*, and *operantium*. But for justice and righteous judgement in a spirituall and an Evangelick way, that belongeth not to the essence of a Magistrate *nec ex conditione seu ex intentione operis, nec ex conditione operantis:* The Holy Ghost requireth it of judges, as they would approve themselves as truly Holy and Religious, and would be accepted of God, and in this sense *Kings as Kings do not serve God*, nor the mediator Christ, nor yet as men; only they serve God and the *mediator Christ as Christian Kings, or as Christian men rather.*

A twofold good in a Christian Magistrate, essentiall, accidentall.

Asser. 3. III. According to that third member of our seventh Distinction; The unjust and evil exercise of the Ministeriall power, is obnoxious to the magistrate as the magistrate, thus, in that he *beareth the sword against all evil doers*, Ro. 13. 1. The magistrate as the magistrate doth only command well doing, in order to praise and a good name, or temporall reward amongst men, *Rom.* 13. 3. *Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the power*, 1 Tim. 5. 17. Matth. 10. 10. Nor can the magistrate as the magistrate promise, or command the Elders to feed the Flock, with the promise of the reward that *Peter* promiseth, 1 *Pet.* 5. 4. to wit, *That when the chief shepheard shall appear, they shall receive a Crown of glory that fadeth not away.* The magistrate as a Preacher (if he be one, as *David* and *Solomon* were both) or as a godly religious Christian man, may hold forth such a promise, but not as a Magistrate, and upon the same ground the

Magi-

Magistrate as the Magistrate cannot forbid careles,unsound preaching,and rigorous and tyrannicall ruling or rather domineering over the Flock, under the pain of death eternall: for he can but kill the body,and hath but the carnall and temporall sword, *Rom.*13.4.and so he can inhibite ill doing only in order to temporary punishment, and though the duty of the former be spirituall, and the sinne of the latter also,yet the externall man is capable only of the Magistrates promises and threatnings,as they respect evill or good temporary; so that it is a wonder to me,that M.*Pryn* or any learned man can say that magistrates can make Lawes to binde the conscience,sure it is ill divinity. 2.If there never had been sin,there should have been no government but of Fathers and Husbands, there should have been no magistraticall dominion, not any magistraticall allurement to weldoing by temporall rewards, not any terrifying from evill doing, from fear of the sword, death, stripes, or bands, and God governed the Apostolick Church,and they attained the Crowne and supernaturall end of life eternall, without the accessory hire of a a temporary reward from the magistrate, and the subsidy of his sword; *Ergo*, it is evident that the magistrate is neither an essentiall, nor an integrall part of the visible Church as the visible Church, injoying all the Ordinances of God,Word, Sacraments, Discipline, Censures, Rebukes, Admonition, Excommunication, Prayers, Mutuall edification, in as great perfection, as is happily attainable in this life without, yea, against the will of the civill magistrate: Though it be a great incouragement to have the King a Nurse-father; yet hath not Christ counted it simply necessary to his visible Church injoying all the Ordinances of God to the full. 3. If the magistrate do only command the teachers and Pastors to preach and determine synodically, in order to a temporall reward, and forbid them to abuse their ministeriall power in order to temporary punishment, by the temporary sword; then surely the Pastors and Teachers are not subjected to them in conscience, after any Ecclesiasticall way, for the power of commanding in magistrates as magistrates must be commensurable to the power of punishing the transgressors of the command; if the one be in order to a temporary good, the other cannot but be in order to an eternall ill; if ministers command in the name of Christ, in order to an eternall reward, they cannot threaten the transgressors in order to a temporary

The Magistrate as such commandeth only in order to temporary reward,and punisheth, and layeth no commands on the conscience.

Nota. rary punishment, but it must be in order to an eternall punishment: so that it is most clear, that the magistrate though he be in some sense a *little God*, and invested with the authority and *Majesty of God*, in that he commandeth and threatneth upon proposall of temporary reward, and temporary good, the very same duties that God injoyneth, and forbiddeth the same evills of sinne that God forbiddeth; yet he holdeth not these out to the soul and conscience of the subjects, as the Ambassador of Iesus Christ, upon condition of eternall life, if they obey, and of eternall death, if they disobey; but he holdeth out to the external man these that are materially divine commandements & divine inhibitions, but in another consideration, but formally only they are the mandates of the Magistrates in order to temporary reward and temporary punishment. Then the Ministers as Ministers in preaching and Synods, forbid adultery, incest, murther; but they propose them to those that are within the visible Church; And that, 1. to their consciences, 2. Under the paine of eternall wrath. 3. As the Ambassadors of Christ craving spirituall subjection of conscience, and divine faith to those charges: But Magistrates as Magistrates hold forth in their Law-abstinence from those same sinnes of adultery, incest, murther; But, 1. Not to the consciences of their subjects, but to the outer man as Members of the common-wealth. 2. Not under the paine of eternall wrath and condemnation, before the judge of quick and dead: Magistrates as Magistrates have neither calling, office, place nor power to threaten or inflict eternall punishment; if Magistrates do perswade the equity of abstinence from adultery, incest, murther, in their Statutes, or Acts of Parliament, from the word of God, from the sixth and seventh command of the Decalogue, from the judgement and eternall punishment that followeth these sinnes, they so perswade not as Magistrates, but as Divines, and as godly and Christian men; yet my sense is not that the Magistrate can Lawfully command obedience in matters of Religion not understood or knowne by the subjects, that were to exact blind obedience; but my meaning is, that the Magistrate as the Magistrate holdeth not forth his commandements to teach and informe the conscience, as Pastors do, but he presupposeth that his mandates are knowne to be agreeable to the word of God, and proposeth them to the subjects to be obeyed. 3. Magistrates as Magistrates hold forth in their Law, abstinence from

Nota. Magistrates as Magistrates forbid not sin as sin under the paine of eternall wrath.

from these sinnes, not as the Ambassadors of Christ, craving subjection of conscience and divine faith to those charges, but only externall obedience: for though Ministers as Ministers crave faith and subjection of conscience to all commandements and inhibitions, as in Christs stead, 2 *Co*.5.19 20. yet the Magistrate as the Magistrate doth not crave either faith or subjection of conscience, nor is he in Christs stead, to lay divine bands on the conscience, to submit the soul and conscience to beleeve and abstaine, he is the deputy of God as the God of Order, and as the Creator, and founder, and another of humane societies, and of Peace, to exact externall obedience, and to lay bands on your hands, not to shed innocent blood, and on your body not to defile it with adultery, or incest, nor to violate the chastity of your brother; hence it is evident, that the adversaries are far out, who would have Ministers who do hold forth commands, that layeth hold on the conscience and craveth faith and soul-submission under the paine of eternall wrath, to do and act as the deputies and Vicars of those who have nothing to do with the conscience, and have neither office nor authority to crave soul submission, or to threaten or inflict any punishment, but such as is circumscribed within the limits of time, and which the body of clay is capable of; yea, when the Magistrate punisheth spirituall sinnes, heresie, idolatry, he punisheth them only with temporary punishment.

Obj. 5. *When a Minister speaketh that which is treason against the Prince in the Pulpit, by way of Doctrine, the Church only doth take on them to judge him, and censure him, and he will not answer the civill judge for his Doctrine, but decline him, and appeal to a Synod; and yet if another man in private speak these same words of treason, he is judged by the civill judge, and can give no declinature against this civill judicature, this must be unequall dealing, except the civill judge may by his office, judge whether the Minister spoke treason or not.*

Ans. It cannot be denied, but that which is spoken by way of Doctrine by an Ambassador, speaking the word in publick, and that which is spoken in private, although the same words, are very different: for a private man in private to slander the Prince may be treason, he hath no place, nor calling to speak of the Prince, but a Pastor hath a calling as the watchman of the Lord of hosts to rebuke

buke *Herod* for incest, and in a constitute Church, the Church is to try whether *John Baptist* preached treason or not. 2. If it be a slander of the Prince and treason indeed, the Prophet who preached it, is first subject to the Prophets, who are to condemne and censure him, and then the magistrate is to inflict bodily punishment on him for it; but the Church should labour to gaine the slanderers soule, before the civill judge take away his life.

IV. *Assert.* The Magistrate *de jure* is obliged not only to permit, but also to procure the free exercise of the ministery in dispensing *Word, Sacraments, and Discipline*, and owe his accumulative power, to convene Synods, to adde his sanction to the lawfull and necessary constitutions and ordination of worthy, and to the Deposition of unworthy officers in the Church. 1. Because he is a *Nurse-father* in the Church, *Isa.* 49 23. 2. And by office, as a *Publike father*, to procure the good of the soules of the subjects in his coactive way, *that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlines and honesty*, 1 Tim. 2. 2. 3. He is not onely to permit, but also positively to procure all peace, in the exercise of all lawfull and profitable trades and Arts; *Ergo*, farre more that *glory may dwell in the Land*, and that the Peace thereof may be as a River, *Isa.* 48. 18. by the presence of *Christ walking in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks.*

V. *Assertion.* When the Magistrate commandeth painfull and sound administration in preaching and governing, with provision of the praysing and rewarding of well doing, he doth not subordinate to himselfe the Ministery in its exercise. 1. Because this promise is accumulative, and of a temporall reward, for the *Magistrate* as the *Magistrate* cannot promise that which *Peter* promiseth; that 1. 1 *Pet.* 5. 4. *When the chiefe shepheard shall appeare, they shall receive a crowne of glory that fadeth not away*, he may as a *Christian* promise that, but for a temporall reward for men, no man for being faithfull in the house of God, hath that unseparably annexed to his labours, by a literall promise in Scripture, and therefore it is onely accumulative. 2. Right and sound preaching and governing in Gods house, cannot from this be said to bee subjected to the Magistrate as a Magistrate, in regard that this is an accidentall hire, and an externall and accessorie good, which the Church as the Church, and the most faithfull Prophets, Apostles,

and

and Pastors have wanted, and yet have attained the end of a Church as a Church visible, nor is this a promise made to the Church as the Church or the Ministers thereof as such, for the Apostolick church that was most poor, had neither thing, nor name, nor promise, but by the contrary, *the Kings and Rulers did conspire against the Kingdome of the son of God.*

VI. *Assertion.* Though the Magistrate may both threaten to inflict, and actually inflict the ill of temporall punishment on Ministers, if they be either idle or unsound in their administration; yet thence can onely be concluded that the male administration of the ministerie is subjected to the Magistrate as such, but not the Ministery it selfe, or the exercise thereof. 1. The male administration of any office is accidentall to the office. 2. This subjecteth the erring person, not the teaching Minister to the civill *Magistrate.* Nor doth this make the *Ministers* in the exercise of their office, properly subordinate to the Ministers, but onely so farre as the *spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets.*

VII. *Assertion.* There is a twofold subordination of the exercise of Male administration of Ministers; one civill, another Ecclesiasticall: These two differ, so as the former must be subordinate to the Magistrate who is to inflict bodily punishment, but the latter is onely subject to the Church. The Judiciall determination according to the Word of God, for the informing of the conscience and gaining to the truth the erring Ministers, is proper to the Colledge of *Ministers*; and in this if the colledge of Ministers erre, they are also punishable, and the Magistrate is to command them to judge and determine, *de novo*, over again: The Magistrate in a constitute church is to determine civilly, and sentence, and civilly punish the Ministers that either are dumbe dogs, and will not barke, or that perverts the souls of people with false doctrine, and where the Church is constituted, it is presumed that the *Priests*, *whose lips should preserve knowledge*, have determined in an Ecclesiasticall way, the very same which the Iudge civilly is to determine, not because the Church hath so determined, but because he judgeth in his conscience it to be according to the Word of God.

Two sorts of subordinations Civill, Ecclesiastick.

Ministers not the Ambassadors of an earthly King, but of the King of Kings.

VIII. *Assertion.* The *Ministers* are in no sort the Ambassadors or servants of the Magistrate, but of Iesus Christ, and immediately in their ministeriall acts subordinate to the King of Kings. 1. They declare

declare the truth in the Name of Christ, their master and Lord, not in the name of the Magistrate, as the *Arminians* make the steps of the subordination. 1. *The Word of God.* 2. *The Magistrate carrying Gods sword.* 3. *The Preachers of the Gospell*; for then the Preachers should hear the word of the Magistrate first, and have the minde of Christ spoken and revealed to them immediately from the magistrate, but mediately onely by the mediation of the Magistrate, the minde of Christ. 2. There should be in every Christian Kingdome, where there is a King, a civill Pope, having directly both the Swords, not with the distinction of *Iesuites*, of *directly and in directly*, and as they say, the Pope hath the temporall sword, *indirectly* and *in ordine ad spiritualia*, in order to spirituall things, and and how many inferiour Magistrates, so many civill *Popes*, onely they shall not be infallible. *Arminians* say that this collection is from envie, *Because We* (say they) *deny a headship and supremacy of power of Government, to your Pastors and Elders in all your Parishes, which maketh the Church a Monster with many heads; therefore you put this, for envy upon the Magistrate, Who yet hath the Word of God above him, which the Pope hath not, Who setteth himself above the Word of God.*

Ans. 1. If we give a supremacy royall, and princely to the Ministers, which they call *Architectonica*, as the adversaries doe to the Magistrate; multitudes of Popes behoved to be in the Church; but we make them meer *Heralds, Trumpeters, and Messengers* to relate the will of God, void of all royall power, and having neither earthly majesty, power, nor Sword. 2. It is not our Argument, that in which they conceive we repose, to wit, that we thinke the adversaries resolve all *ultimatè*, and last which concerneth the government of the Church, in the will of the Magistrate, as on an infallible rule, we grant they teach that the Word of God is to rule the Magistrate *in the matters of the first Table*, and justice and equity in the things of the second Table, but they say this in words onely, but the Magistrate as Magistrate may mould out of his high dominion what Church government he will, and this by consequent resolveth all in the Magistrates will; and that they teach, that when the Magistrate doth command against the Word of God, then it is better *to obey God then men.* And 2. This we infer as an absurdity that they cannot shun that there is such a

Church Officers as such not subordinate to the Magistrate.

new

new officer, a new Church head, a creature most like a Pope in every Christian Kingdome brought in the Church, who is above Bishops, Pastors, Doctors, who by office must carry the minde of God to Pastor and people, who hath the keyes of the House to make and unmake, call and send, recall and exantorate ministers as his Servants and Heralds. 3. Looke what power the *Magistrate* as a *Magistrate* hath in civill affaires, the same hath he in dispensing Word, Sacraments, admitting to, or rejecting from the Sacraments, calling of ministers, excommunicating by this way, and so by office, he is no lesse essentially a Pastor to watch for the soule, then he is a civill Judge. 4. How doth this confound the two Kingdomes? the Kingdome that is of this world, and fighteth with the Sword; and the Kingdome that is not of this world, and fighteth not with the Sword? if the magistrate as the magistrate and armed with the sword, be the supream Head over both, and as he beareth the Sword have a carnall dominion over the Church as the Church? 5. If God have made the subordination of ministers as ministers, and servants of the magistrate as a magistrate, then the visible Church hath no ordinary right, to Ordinances, Word, Sacraments, discipline, but by the magistrate; and all that the *Churches* did in the Apostles times, or the first three hundred yeers after Christ; being contrary to the magistrates will, must be either seditious, or then it was by no rule of the Gospell, but by an extraordinary dispensation; and we shall have no warrant for any dispensing of the Word, and of Seals, or Government from the Apostolique Church, because all that must have beene beside the rule and extraordinary. 6. From this pretended subordination, as the supream magistrate may doe all that the inferiour magistrate may doe, because the King is eminently all that the inferiour *Magistrate* is, and something more; so may he dispense the Word and Sacraments, in regard that the King is by the same officiall power over the Church as the Church, *in sacris*, in all matters of Religion, as in civill things, and containeth in him, in a high and eminent manner, all that the Church and *Pastors* can doe, as they are such, and because the King hath the same power, in all Arts and Trades, then by his Royal power he might (if he had time and leasure) build houses, because of his royall Eminency over all Trades, he might sit at the helme of any ship, and steer and rule it, he might

paint Images, he might plow the ground, because he hath the like Royall power over masons, Sailors, Painters, Husband-men, carpenters, and the like, as he hath over the common-wealth, and the Church; we must then say that God hath called the King to all these to be a minister, a mason, a Sailor, a Painter, and if he had leasure, he hath Gods calling to be a Preacher, a Sailor, as to be a King, yea, and that as King he is all these: Now the Apostle clearly distinguisheth between him who exhorteth and teacheth in the Church, *Rom.* 12. and him who is the *Minister of God, and beareth not the sword in vaine*, Rom. 13. and clearly insinuateth a distinction of calling, so that God never called one man to all callings, as it is 1. Cor. 7. 17. *But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walke*, ver. 20. *Let every one abide in the same calling wherein he was called*: And it is clear, if the King be a Head in the body, 1 *Cor.* 12. then he is not the feet, though he have need of the feet, for then the eye should be both eye and eare, and hand, and therefore the King cannot be all. *Pareus* in *Rom.* 13. saith, the King cannot doe some things *ob defectum juris ex Dei limitatione, He cannot preach.* Ans. *Ergo*, Preaching belongeth by Divine right to another, and its not subordinate to him, *jure Divino.* 2. Saith *Pareus, he wanteth law to use the Wife of another man as his owne. Ans.* Then the right of Husband and Wife is not subordinate to the King, so as he may use the right of a Husband, because it is against the seventh Commandement, nor can he invade the right of Pastors to dispense Word and Sacraments, it being against the second Commandment, he not being called thereunto. 3. *Other things* (saith he) *he cannot doe for want of skill, as to teach in a Colledge, and others he cannot doe, because they are fordid, as to sew shooes. Ans.* If God have not called the Prince to these, it is not onely fordid, but unlawfull for him to thrust his sickle in another mans field, for God must call to a lawfull calling, else men use a lawful thing unlawfully, so it is fordid and unlawfull for him to judge those, and the like. *Erastus* I know roundly granteth that the King or any *Magistrate may lawfully dispence the Word and Sacraments, nothing hindereth him, but want of time*, which is a better Answer then others give, who hold the same principles with *Erastus*, and that the King hath the same Royall power in things civill and Ecclesiastick, except the adversary flee to our

distin-

distinction of power and persons, and of things civill and sacred, they shall never expede themselves. *But the King* (say they) *is not capable of* 1. *The power of Order, he cannot be a Pastor, or a Doctor.* 2. *He cannot as King be capable of internall power of jurisdiction, he cannot preach, he cannot dispense the Sacraments, but he is* (say they) *capable of externall power of jurisdiction, to governe the Church, excommunicate, to debarre Apostates and Hereticks from the Sacraments, to create Prelates, Primates, Metropolitans, and such cattell, to call and ordaine, make and unmake Ministers, to make all Canons and Ecclesiasticall Lawes, and appoint religious Ceremonies, as holy Surplice, crossing, oyle and spittle in Baptisme, to create holy dayes, to command men to kneel to bread, and to order all the externall Worship of God, and beside the Word, to order many little and smaller things in the borders of Worship externall, such as is some little Idolatry, and Superstition*: And (for ought I know) by their way, who hold there is no certaine forme of Government of Gods House in the Scripture, *some harmelesse and innocent golden Calves, as lawfull as religious symbolicall Ceremonies.* This power is no more due to the *Magistrate* as the *Magistrate*, then to dispense the Sacraments, as I have said before: Nor doe the *Arminians* much honour the *Magistrate, who walking in the steps of* Erastus *doe hold, that the Magistrate having power of publique places, Preachers are obliged not to preach in publike places, if the Magistrate forbid them, but they may preach in private places.* But 1. These same *Arminians* hold that Pastors are to preach whatever in their conscience seems to be the truth of God; a principle of those who are for tolleration of all Religions; though *Iudaisme* & *Turcisme*, a way (I am perswaded) most abominable, and which the Lord of his Church will crush, when he shal bring down other Antichristiã untruths to the ground; Now it seems to the conscience of Papists and many Hereticall teachers, that they are obliged to preach Turcisme, & Iudaisme in the Temple, and in publike, & that distincton is false & vain, as it is in very deed contrary to the truth of God, to preach what they think the truth of God, & to preach it in publike or private, or in any place is indifferent as touching the place. 2. The Lord hath no more given to Magistrates power of places, or actions religious in places, then he hath given to them power of truths: *Ergo*, they must be obliged in conscience, rejecting a vain and

See the Arminian Remonstrance in Apol. c. 25. fol. 299, 300.

What power *Erastians* give to Magistrates in Church matters,

The minde of *Arminians* touching the Magistrates power in Church matters. *Remonstrant. Arminian* c. 25. p. 304

Iac. Trig. de potest. civi.& Ecclesiastica dissertatio, Theol.p.123 Templorum usus & stipendiorum publicorum hac in re nihil potest. ille enim extrinsecus accedit ad res Ecclesiasticas, earumque naturam atque indolem nihil immutat.

and sapleſſe diſtinction, to preach in publike places: for as that judicious and learned profeſſor *Iac. Triglandius* ſaith, *The place is accidentall to the Worſhip, and changeth not the nature of it*; and truly as that learned profeſſor ſaith, it is a poor honour that they put on the Magiſtrate, to limit all his power to places and ſtipends. 3. The Apoſtles knew not this diſtinction, for they not only preached truth, the Scribes and Phariſees forbidding them; but in publick places, and at all occaſions, *and dayly in the Temple, and in every houſe, they ceaſed not to teach and preach Ieſus Chriſt*; Act.6.2,4. & 4.1.20. & 5.20,21. The Magiſtrate being Antichriſtian forbiddeth not preaching of ſaving truths, becauſe of the place, be it private or publick; but he forbiddeth them, becauſe they are ſaving, and if Ieſus Chriſt have called a man to preach in publick, in the houſe tops, the Magiſtrate hath no power from God to ſilence him in publick more then in private; the Magiſtrate forbiddeth that any teach falſe Doctrine, not for the place, but becauſe it is injurious and hurtfull to humane ſocieties that men ſhould be principled in a falſe Religion, and cannot but diſturbe the publick peace.

A threefold conſideration of the magiſtrate in relation to the Church

IX. *Aſſer.* The Chriſtian magiſtrate muſt here come under a threefold conſideration. 1. As the Object of that high office is meerly and purely civill, and poſitive relating only to a civill end of Peace: as in importing, or exporting of goods, of wooll, waxe, moneys for the good of the common-wealth, the crying up or crying downe of the value of coyned Gold or Silver, the making of Lawes meerly civill; as not to carry Armor in the night in ſuch a City: So in Warre, Commanders, Captains and Colonels are Magiſtrates to order the Battle, lay ſtratagems, the way of beſieging Townes, of fortifying Caſtles, of iſſuing out mandates for the Navy; The Parliaments power in diſpoſing of Fouling, Fiſhing, Hunting, Eating of Fleſh, or not eating at ſuch a time: all theſe, as the Word of God doth not particularly warrant the one ſide more then the other, are meerly civill and poſitive: It is ſure the Magiſtrate hath a ſupremacy, and an independency above the Church or Miniſters of the Goſpel in all theſe; and as theſe preſcinde from all Morality of the firſt and ſecond Table, I hold that neither the power nor perſon of the Magiſtrate is ſubordinate to the Church and Church-aſſemblies, and Miniſters of the Goſpel ſhould ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν and exceed the limits and bounds of their calling, if they ſhould

ſhould meddle with theſe; as the Church ſhould exceed their bounds, if they ſhould make Canons touching the way of ſayling, painting, tilling the earth according to ſuch and ſuch principles of Art, for theſe are without the ſphere of the Churches activity; in this conſideration that learned and grave Divine Doctor *Andrew Rivetus* in *Decalo* in *c.* 5. ſaith well, *pag.* 204. That as we beleeve a man well skilled in his owne Art, ſo that his judgement is a ſupream rule; ſo the ſupream authority of the Magiſtrate to us in things poſitive, is a rule; for indeed it cannot be denied but there be *Arcana Imperij* ſecrets of State that are not to be communicated to Paſtors or to any, in which the Rulers have a ſupremacy. The Magiſtrate falleth under a ſecond conſideration, as he giveth out Lawes juſt or unjuſt, and executeth judgement in the morning, or ſuffereth the eyes of the poore, the widdow and Orphane to faile for want of juſtice; and in theſe he is not ſubject to the Church and Paſtors ſo, but only as if he ſinne in making Lawes, the Paſtors may humbly ſupplicate that he would recall thoſe unjuſt Lawes, and judge over againe righteous judgement, and this exhorting of the Paſtors is a ſubjecting of the Magiſtrate to the Paſtors *quoad actus imperatos*; ſo have Generall aſſemblies in the Church of *Scotland* humbly ſupplicated the King and Parliament to retreat Laws made againſt the liberties of the Church, in favour of Antichriſtian Prelates and Ceremonies; but *quoad actus elicitos*: The Church and Paſtors themſelves cannot uſurpe the throne, and give out civill Lawes that are righteous, and judge righteouſly: for the poor in the place of King, Parliament and Iudges; for in this alſo the judges are ſupream and independent, and ſubject only to God the Creator, as his Vicars and Deputies in Gods univerſall Kingdome of power called *univerſale regnum potentiæ*, by Divines; they are Gods, and the ſhields of the world, and here only as they erre, not as they judge, are they ſubject to rebukes and threatnings, and admonitions of the Church and Miniſters of the Goſpel: Even as the Magiſtrate may command the Paſtors to preach and diſpenſe the Sacraments aright, but the Magiſtrate himſelfe can neither preach nor diſpenſe the Sacraments: ſo the Schoolmen ſay, that the actions of the underſtanding depend on the will, *quoad exercitium*, the will may ſet the mind to think on this or that truth; but not *quoad ſpecificationem*. The will it ſelfe can neither aſſent, nor diſſent from a truth, nor can the will command

Courſe of conformity, part 3. pag. 146.

command the mind to assent to a known untruth, or dissent from a known truth; the mind or understanding naturally doth both, and this distinction holdeth in acts of the civill power, and in acts meerly Ecclesiasticall. The third consideration of the Christian Magistrate is as he is a man, and a member of a Christian Church who hath a soul to be saved, and in this, he is to submit to Pastors, as those that watch for his soul, *Heb.*13.17. as others who have souls to be saved.

Reciprocation of subordinations between Church and Magistrate.

X. *Ass.* Hence I am not affraid to assert a reciprocation of subordinations, between the Church and the Magistrate, and a sort of collaterality and independent supremacy in their own kind common to both, for every soul, Pastors and others, are subject to the Magistrate as the higher power, in all civill things, *Rom.*13.1,2,3,4. *Tit.*3.1. 1 *Pet.*2.13,14. *Mat.*22.21. and all members of the common-wealth, being members of the Church in soul-matters, are subject to the Church and Pastors in their authoritative dispensing of Word, Sacraments and Church censures: Nor are any Magistrates or other who have souls excepted, *Heb.*13.17. *Mat.*16.19. *Mat.*18.18. *Joh.*20. 21. *Act.*15.20,21,22,23. *Mat.* 10.40,41,42. So Protestant writers who have written on this subject Teach: As the learned *Walens*, judicious *Trig.* that most learned Divine, *And. Rivetus*; the grave and learned professors of *Leyden*, *Zipperus*, *Calv. Petr. Cabel Javius*, reverend and pious M. *John Cotton*, judicious *P. Mar. D. Pareus*, all the Protestant confessions. The *Augustine* confession distinctly of *Helvetia*. The confession of *Sweden*, the *Saxon*. The *English* confession and that of *Scotland*, all our Divines; while *Erastus*, *Utenbogard*, *Hu. Grotius*, *Vedelius*, (*Bullinger*, *Gualtherus*, going before them; yet not every way theirs) did teach the contrary. The *Arminians* in *Holland* did thus flatter the Magistrate for their owne politick ends, and some Court Divines made the King of *England* Head of the Church, in the place of the Pope, which *P. Mar.* excused and expounded benignly; *some say it is against reason that there should be two supreams collaterall powers, and especially in a mutuall subordination.* But can we deny this reciprocation of subordinations? it is evident in many things; if the King be in an extream fea-

Ant. Walens, p.2. de quatenus pastor subjiciatur magist. pag.15, 16.
Iac. Trig. disser. Theol. de potest. civ. & Eccles. c.5. pag.124. profess. Leyden in Syno. purioris. Theol. dis. de disc. Eccles. & de magistrati. Zipperus de politea Ecclesiast. l.3. c.13. Calvinus Instit. l.4. c.11. Pet. Cabel Iavius in apologetico Rescript pro libert. Eccles. c.6. p. 79. M. Cot. in a Model of Church and civill power. *P. Matyr. loc. Communi. l.4. c.13. D. Pareus in prefat. ad hoseam. Epist. ad Iangravi. August. confess. Artic. de potest. Eccles. Helv. confess.* Anno 1566. *Art.*18. *Sucvica confess. Art.*13. *Saxonica Art.*12. *Anglic.* fol. 132. *Scotic. confess.*

ver,

ver, one of his own subjects, a skill'd Physitian forbiddeth him to drink wine, the King is to obey him as a Physitian, by vertue of the sixth command, as the King would not kill himselfe: And yet by vertue of the fifth command, the Physitian being the Kings subject, is subject to the Laws of the King. The Queen of *Scotland* as a wife, was to be subject to her Husband in the Lord, as the Word of God commandeth, *Ephes.*5.22. and her owne Husband not being King, but a subject, was to obey his Wife, the Princes and supream Magistrate according to the Word of God, *Rom.* 13.1. 1 Pet.2.13,14. *Tit.*3.1. Yea, all Arts have a sort of collaterall and co-equall dignity, and we are to believe a skilled Artist in his owne Art, though this Artist be a servant, a vassal, a slave to those who do yeild to him in his owne Art.

CHAP. XXV. Quest.21.

Objections touching the subordinations of Magistrate and Church removed.

THere is nothing more hated by the Adversaries then the pretended emulation of those two superlatives and highest powers: Some Object, 1. *Are not all powers on earth subject to the Magistrate? Ministers of the Gospel not excepted; doth not the Magistrate command the Pastors to preach the Word?*

Ans. All power deviating offensively, and to the disturbance of societies in Morals, is subject to the Civill power and the Sword; and every power failing against the Law and Gospel within the bosome of the Church, is subject to the Word of God, in the mouth of the Ministers, who are nothing but Servants and Heralds; so that the subjection is to God, not to the Church, and in a spirituall and Ecclesiasticall way: See *P. Martyr. Lo. Com.*l.4.c.13. *& seq*; Its but a poor evasion of *Vedelius*, *to say, That the Magistrate is subject to the Church Catachrestice & abusive, unproperly and abusively.* 1. Because the Ministers as the Ambassadors of Christ do properly and not abusively preach the Gospel to Magistrates. 2. Magistrates are not unproperly the sheepe of Christ; yea, they are to

the adversaries chief Members of the Church; *Ergo*, they are that way subject as other Members, as *Pareus* saith, *Com. Rom.* 13. Nor, 3. Will that prove any thing that the Pastors are Ministers, not Lords: for to people and Prince as they have souls to be saved, they are Ministers, and by this people should abusively be subiect as well as Magistrates: But *Vedelius* freeth Magistrates from subjection to Pastors; because they are subject to the Word of God, not to Pastors, but so are the people subject also the same way.

Obj. 2. *Then may the Church censure all sinnes, even those that are most proper to the civill judge, such as sorcery, parricide, sodomie, for the which the Magistrate is to draw the sword, and for which the Lord made the land to cast out seven great Nations.*

Ans. The case is one within the Church, and another without the Church. 2. It is one in the case of a confused, or backsliding Church, another in the Church rightly constitute and pure; without the Church, God intendeth nothing, either in the intention of the worker or the work; but the externall peace of humane society: Then, I grant the Magistrate is at the first without any previous labours of religious men, to save the soul of the offender, to take care of peace and the conservation of humane society; But within the visible Church, where the Gospel is preached, it is presumed, that God intendeth salvation in regard of the intention of the work, the Gospel being preached to all within the visible Church; if therefore any within the visible Church, fall in horrible scandals, and such as are capitall, in the intention of Gods dispensation, without the Church, God intendeth nothing but peace; But in regard of the intention of Gods dispensation, within the Church, where the Gospel is preached, he intendeth both peace by the godly Magistrates care and eternall life, by the preaching of the Gospel; Because therefore life eternall is more necessary then externall peace, it is necessary that the Church first labour to try, cognosce of, and cure the mans soul by rebukes, threats, conviction; and (if need be) by excommunication, that the souls of many may be saved from the contagion of scandal, before the Magistrate punish either to death, (if the scandal so deserve) or by any coactive way by the sword, the genuine fruit whereof is not repentance and gaining of the mans soul, except by accident and through the co-operation of a higher hand, above nature even of free grace)

but

but the externall peace of the common-wealth; hence in a constitute Church, the Magistrate is not to proceed with the sword against the body of any Member of the Church, while the Church first try and attempt how to save his soul; therefore the Magistrate is to sentence none as punishable by the sword, while first he be laboured on by the Church, and upon a previous sentence of the Church; then must the Magistrates judging of a scandalous Church-member be subsequent, and the Churches judging antecedent: But, 2. If the Church be remisse, this is a defect, and somewhat extraordinary; if the Magistrate command the Church to do their duty, and they neglect to do it, the Magistrates cognizance then may be antecedent and not consequent, and the case of a Church erring in a fact, is, as if, in that fact, there were no Church.

Obj. 3. *Those are subordinate to the Church, whose judgement and sentences are subjected to the Church, to be tryed or condemned by the Church, but the judgement and sentences of the Magistrate are subjected to the Church*; Ergo, *and by the like they prove, Pastors to be subjected to the Civill Magistrate, because their preaching, their dispensing of the seals, their sentences in their Presbytery are subjected to the Magistrate, so as he may absolve, or condemne.*

Ans. Vedelius shall never prove the Major, as touching the subjection or subordination in question; *he is subject to the Magistrate, whose sentence or judgement is subject, in an antecedent cognizance,* and in a coactive corporall way, it is true: But now the assumption is false, in a constitute Church, the sentence or thing sentenced or judged by the Church, is subject to the Magistrate in a subsequent cognizance, and in a corporall coactive way only: But not in an antecedent cognizance, and by a way of Ecclesiasticall censuring; we acknowledge a subordination of the Churches sentence to the Magistrate, in regard of the Magistrates externall care to punish iniquity in any; not in regard of intrinsecall judging and dealing with the conscience, the Church is to give a reason of their sentence from the Word of God, to the Magistrate when he demandeth it.

Obj. 4. *Ministers as Ministers are subjects of the King*; Ergo, *the King judgeth them as Ministers.*

Ans. I deny the antecedent: The Ministery as such is an Ordinance of God, and cannot be judged; nor are Ministers, nor Painters as Painters, nor Musitians as Musitians, nor Saylors as Saylors subjects;

subjects; these reduplications be cousening and deceiving notions: painters as painters are regulated by Art, & subject to be judged by painters; but as men they are subjects, & so are Ministers as men subject to *Cesar*; as Ministers they are the servants of Christ, & not subjects. Ob. *As Ministers they are either Magistrates or subjects; but Ministers as Ministers are not Magistrates: He that is not with Christ is against him*, M. Coleman *in his Brotherly examination*, p. 21. saith, *He that doth not manage his office under Christ, and for Christ, must manage it under the Devil, and for the Devil; if therefore the Christian Magistrate do not manage his office under, and for Christ, he must manage it under, or for the Devil, which were blasphemous.* *Ans.* I deny the Major proposition: Ministers as Ministers are neither Magistrates, nor subjects; but formally the separated servants of Christ, set a part for the work of gathering the Saints: Now to be subjects, is to be judged by the Magistrate in those things, in which they are subjects, that is, in all Civill businesse they are, and false teaching discerned by the Church to be false teaching, or in case the Church corrupt themselves, then are Ministers obnoxions to bodily punishment to be inflicted by the Magistrate; But this is properly to be a subject of the Magistrate, to be lyable to the civill cognizance, trying, and bodily punishment inflicted by the Magistrate, and to be a subject; and a member of the other Kingdome, is to be subject to the Ecclesiasticall cognizance, tryall, and censure of the Church, as a matter that concerneth the soul; hence the former concerneth the body and outward man, the latter the inner man, and the soul. 2. The former concerneth peace with men and edification, to be procured by a mean extrinsecall to edification, to wit, by the sword; the latter concerneth peace with God, by a spirituall sword, the Word of God. 3. The former is carnall, and of the Kingdome of this world; the latter spirituall and of Christs other Kingdome, that is not of this world, *Ioh.* 18.36. 4. The former worketh by coaction and bodily violence; the latter by removing unwillingnesse and making a rebellious soul obedient. 5. The former is an act of justice not terminated on repentance, or the mans turning to God, as an end; for whether this end be obtained, or no, the Magistrate is to use the sword; the other is terminated on repentance, as its end: *He that is not with Christ, is against Christ, and with the Devil*; Its true, in all professors of the Gospel, as professors, no man, but he must

The Ministers as Ministers neither Magistrates nor subjects.

The Magistrate as such neither manageth his office under Christ as mediator, nor under Satan, but under God as creator.

be

be either on the one side, or on the other, either for, or with Christ, or against him: But it is not true with every reduplication; *thus Ministers as Ministers are subjects of, or to the King, and to obey him in the Lord, and so with Christ, hath this sense, Ministers essentially and formally are subjects of, or to the King to obey him in the Lord*; so as Ministers do lose the effence and formality of the office of the Ministery; if they be not the Kings subjects, and with Christ; this is most false, for *Judas* should not be a Minister of Christ then, in that he was not subject to the Law of *Cesar*, that is, that the servant and disciple should be for, and under his master and Lord, it only followeth; *Ergo, Judas* was not a godly Minister, but under the Devil, not under Christ; Magistrates do neither essentially as Magistrates cleave to Christ, nor fight against Christ; but as holy men they cleave to Christ, as sinfull men they fight against Christ.

2. Master *Coleman* knoweth that we speak of the office of a Magistrate as a Magistrate, not under the accidents of Christian, or heathenish; there was no reason he should apply his Argument to the Parliament, except to make us odious, as if we did not as much honour or pray for the Parliament and King, as himselfe: But it concludeth equally against all Magistrates, and let him see it in a heathen Magistrate as a Magistrate: for a heathen Magistrate as a Magistrate, doth either manage his office under Christ, and for Christ, or under the Devil, and for the Devil. This I and Master *Coleman* also shall deny, for a heathen Magistrate as a Magistrate, doth not manage his office under, or for Christ, as mediator; because he is utterly ignorant of Christ, for he hath no more, but what God as creator and nature gave him, saith Master *Coleman*, pag. 20. and the other horne of the Argument, is as weak for this, *The heathen Magistrate as such manageth his office under, or for the Devil*, is blasphemous, for so Magistracy and the office should be intrinsecally unlawfull, and for the Devil: But it is intrinsecally the Ordinance of God, *Rom.* 13. and apply this to God as creator, it shall appear of force. The Magistrate as the Magistrate, doth either manage his office under, and for God creator, or under, and for the Devil. The former part is true, because God creator and nature made the office of Magistracy, apply it to a heathenish husband, Father, Master, Musitian, Painter, under these reduplications and it shall make the relation of Husband Deviliſh, or this proposition,

sition, *(a Husband, a Father as a Father, and a Husband, manage their office, under, and for Christ the mediator, or under, or for the Devil)* is most false and blasphemous: the former part is false; for there should have been, and was Father and Husband which did manage the duties of these relations, for God creator, not for Christ mediator; though Christ had never taken on our nature, never been mediator, never been King and Priest of his redeemed Church. The latter part is blasphemous, for then *Adam* had managed the part of Husband and Father under the Devil, and for the Devil, even before he fell in sinne, and in the state of Innocency. 3. Mr. *Colemans* meaning is, that the Magistrate as the Magistrate, and by office is under Christ mediator, as his supream and immediate vicegerent as mediator; now in this sense, Christs saying *(he that is not against us, is with us)* shall not prove the truth of the proposition, which must be this, and is most false, to wit, that (The Magistrate as the Magistrate, by office, is either under Christ mediator, as the supream and immediate vicegerent of him as mediator, or he is by office under the Devil.) This we deny, for one might argue thus of the Apostle *Paul*, who was either as an Apostle for Christ, or against Christ; *Paul* as an Apostle is either under Christ the mediator, and his supream and immediate vicegerent, having power of both Swords, or he is under the Devil: The proposition is most false; for *Paul* is neither of them, so say we here; the Magistrate doth neither manage his office, as a Magistrate under Christ mediator, as his Vicar, and a little head of the Church, nor yet doth the Magistrate manage his office under, or for the Devil, God save the Magistrate, *datur tertium*, he is for Christ as a Christian, and as a Christian; but as a Magistrate he is not for Christ as mediator, that is, as having his office of Christ as mediator, and being from Christ a Magistrate, that is, as M. *Coleman* expoundeth it an officer, *having power of both the Swords*: for Mr. *Coleman* saith, *p.20. Christian Magistracy is an Ecclesiasticall administration*; Ergo, he hath the power of the Spirituall Sword, and *Paul, Rom.* 13. saith, he hath from God the power of the other Sword: Yea, we cannot say that a Magistrate as a Magistrate, or a Minister as a Minister, are either redeemed and saved in Christ, nor no redeemed, or no saved in Christ, but in another reduplication: The Magistrate as a Magistrate, is not redeemed, but as an elected

elected man; nor is he damned, or not redeemed as a Magistrate, but as a reprobate and an unbeleeving man; and the like I say of a Minister, he that is not with Christ, as his immediate and supream swordbearer, is not against Christ, for so all the world except the Prince, should be against him.

Obj. 5. *The Magistrate as he defendeth the body, and goods, so also the the fame of men; hence what is a matter of good or ill report is judged by the Magistrate, who may put ill doers to shame,* Iudg. c. 18.7. *But Church scandals, blasphemy, heresie, apostacy, are matters of ill report, and of shame;* Ergo, *they are to be judged by the Magistrate.*

Ans. Non concluditur negatum, We deny not but the Magistrate may judge and put to shame offenders, but it is civill shame, by which the Magistrate judgeth any offender to be an evill Citizen and hurtfull member of the common-wealth, *Iudg.* 18.17. The Church hath no power thus to judge, or thus to put to shame: But there is an Ecclesiasticall shame, in which the Church judgeth, whether such a man be a sound and faithfull subject of the Kingdome of Christ, or a hurtfull Member of the Church, and of this shame speaketh *Paul*, 2 *Thess.* 3.14. *keep no company with him, that he may be ashamed*; and the same way we are to distinguish, a good name for it is an honour, that it be said of any man, as *Psal.* 87. *This man was borne in Zion.*

Obj. 6. *What the Magistrate as a Magistrate punisheth, that as a Magistrate he judgeth; but as a Magistrate he punisheth Idolatry and heresie;* Ergo, *as a magistrate he judgeth it.*

Ans. What the Magistrate punisheth, that he judgeth *distinguo*: What he punisheth, that he judgeth, the way that he punisheth, for as he punisheth civilly and with the sword; so he judgeth in a civill way, not as a Church scandal, but as a civill disturbance. 2. In a constitute Church, by a subsequent judging after those *Whose lips should preserve knowledge*, have judged it to be Idolatry, and heresie; he is to judge it, and in order to corporall punishment, its true, and thus the Major is granted: But the assumption is false, for the Magistrate judgeth nothing as scandalous, no Idolatry, or heresie, with an antecedent judgement, and with order to Ecclesiasticall punishment to gain the soul. Obj. *But there is no other judging or punishing required, but such as the magistrate inflicteth.* *Ans.* This is a false

a false principle, and everteth all Church Government.

Obj. 7. *But so you make two supream magistrates, the King and the Church, two collaterall supremacies; yet so as the magistrates conscience lyeth under the feet of the Church.*

Ans. The Church hath a Ministery, no dominion of Magistracy. 2. There is a collaterality without equality. The Magistrate is highest and worthiest, the other hath no dignity, no supereminency, but to be authoritative declarers of the mind of Christ. 3. The Magistrate is no more tyed to the judgement of a Synod, or Church, then any private man is tyed in his practice; the tye in Discipline and in all Synodicall acts and determinations, is here as it is in preaching the Word, the tye is secondary, conditionall, with limitation in so farre as it agreeth with the Word, not absolutely obliging, not *Papal, qua* or because commanded, or because determined by the Church, and such as Magistrates, and all Christians may reject, when contrary to, or not warranted by the Word of God.

Obj. 8. *But Pastors have authority equally immediate and independent under God, as the magistrate hath, and what more can they have except the Crowne and Scepter? is not this an emulous and odious equality, beside a collaterality? hence they cry the liberty, the liberty of the Kingdome of Christ, the right, the power of the Church is taken away, so often as the magistrate punisheth scandals.*

Ans. Non-subordination can never inferre equality, who denieth that the Magistrate may command the Husband and Wife to do a duty to each other, the father not to provoke the son, the sonne not to disobey the Father, the Pastor and People, the Master and Servant, the Captaine and Souldier, to do a duty each, one to another. And there is a proper right and liberty, and power immediately given by God, without the King or Magistrates interposing of their authority: to all these, the Kings authority maketh not the man a Father, nor the Sonne subject to the Father, nor the Servant to the Master, nor the Souldier to the Commander. God immediately made those powers, and God in the Law of nature hath given a power to the Father over the sonne, without the Magistrate; yea, though there had never been a Magistrate in the world: so the Pastors and Elders by divine institution, have a power and liberty to feed and governe the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, and set them over as those who must

give

give an account to the great Shepherd, *Acts* 20. 28, 29. 1 *Thes.* 5. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 17. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. now it no more followeth that all Fathers are equall to the Magistrate, all Masters, all Captains to the King, then that the Church or Pastors are equall to the King, for *Fathers, Masters, Captaines, Husbands* have immediately from God in the Law of Nature, a supream, a high and independent Authority as the Church hath, without any intervention of the will or authority of King or any earthly Magistrate, and without any subordination as they are such to the Prince. 2. The emulation between the Magistrate and Pastors is no more in point of government, then in point of preaching, exhorting, rebuking even of Kings and all that are in Authority; now we have both demonstrated from the Word, and have the grant of Adversaries, that in point of preaching and rebuking, the Pastors have an immediate supremacy and independency under Iesus Christ; and all emulation here, is from men who will not submit to the yoke of Christ. 3. If the Magistrate should usurpe over Husbands, and Masters and Fathers, their *jus maritale, herile, Paterum*, and spoil them of Husband-power, and masterly and fatherly power, as our Adversaries counsell the Magistrate to take the spirituall right and power of the keyes of the Kingdome of God, from the Church and Pastors, the former should complaine, as do the latter.

Object. 8. *But if the Kingdome be heathenish, and the heart of the King be first supernaturally affected, then Religion beginneth at him as a Magistrate, and he may appoint gifted men after they are converted to preach the Gospell*; Ergo, *The first rise of Religion is from the Magistrate as the Magistrate.*

Ans. If the King be converted first as a Christian, not as a Magistrate, he may spread the Gospell to others, and preach himselfe but not as a Magistrate, as *Iehoshaphat* commanded the Levites to do their dutie, so might he command those of the house of *Aaron*, who had deserted the Priests office, to take the office on them, to which God had called them, so here gifts and faithfulnes appearing to the new converted Prince, he is to command those so gifted, (for their gifts and faithfulnes is as evident a call as to be borne the sonnes of *Aaron*,) to take on them the calling of preaching and of dispensing the Seals. But 1. he ordaineth them not

Pastors as a Prince, but commandeth them to follow the calling which now the Church not constitute, cannot give. 2. He can preach himselfe as a gifted beleever, in an extraordinary exigence, but he cannot doe this as a *Magistrate*, yea, *Moses* did never prophecy as a *Magistrate*, nor *David* as a King. 2. All the rise that Religion hath from the Prince as the Prince in this case is civill, that men gifted may be commanded by civill Authority, to dispence Word and Sacraments, but nothing Ecclesiasticall is here done by the Prince as the Prince. 3. The highest power in the Church as the Church, and the highest amongst men, as men, are much different. The *Magistrates* power in commanding that this Religion that is true and consonant to the Word of God be set up, and others that are false be not set up in his Kingdome, is a civill power, and due to him as a Magistrate, but a highest Church power, to dispense Word and Sacraments agreeth to no *Magistrate* as a *Magistrate*; but it followeth not, that when the true Religion is erected by his power as a *Magistrate*, that he may as a *Magistrate* dispence Word, Sacraments, and Synodicall acts and censures; except God have called him to preach the Word, and to use the sword of the other Kingdome, as a Member of the Church joyned with the Church.

A Prince as a gifted Christian may preach and spread the Gospell to a land where the Gospell hath not bin heard before, but not as a Magistrate.

Object. 9. *But the Magistrate is unproperly subject to the Pastor, Who is but a meer Herald, servant, and Minister, Who hath all his authority from the Word of another, and so it is but* imperium alienum, *a borrowed power, he is subject properly to Christ speaking in his Word.* Titius *is subject to the King properly, but unproperly to the Kings Herald.*

Ità videlius. Ep. Const. quest. 11.

Ans. 1. Let the subjection be unproper, there can no conclusion from thence be drawn against us, If 1. The Pastors as Pastors have their commissions from Christ and be his immediate Servants, and have no Commission Pastorall from the Magistrate, as the power of the Herald floweth immediately from the royall power of the King, and he is the Kings immediate servant; then to obey him in those acts which he performeth in the Kings name, is to obey the King; and in those acts subjects doe properly obey the Herald; and so here *Heb.* 13. *Obey those that are over you in the Lord*, according to that, *He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you despiseth me.* 2. It is enough for our purpose that Magistrates

giſtrates are ſo to obey Paſtors in the Lord, and Paſtors are ſo ſupreame under Chriſt as the Magiſtrate is not above them, and they have their Ambaſſage, calling, and commiſſion immediately from Ieſus Chriſt, without the intervention of the Magiſtrates Authority.

Obj. *But the obedience of the Magiſtrate to the Paſtors, is not abſolute, but conditionall, if they command in the Lord*; Ergo, *It is no kindly obedience and ſubjection.*

Anſ. It followeth not, for ſo we ſhould give no kindly obedience to Kings, to Parents, to Maſters, for we obey them onely conditionally in the Lord, as they warrant their Commandement from the Word. Yet *Vedelius* will not ſay, it is unproper ſubjection we owe to the King, nor can he ſay that the Royall power is *imperium alienum, a begged power*, all obedience to men this way is begged, and if we come to Logick, if I ſhould ſay the nature and definition of obedience agreeth not univocally to obedience to God, and to obedience to the creature, *Vedelius* ſhould hardly refute me. It is enough Miniſters of the Goſpell diſcharge an Ambaſſage in the roome and place of God, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. God commandeth in his Miniſters, a limited obedience, is kindly obedience.

Obj. 10. *The keeping of the booke of the Law is given to the King*, Deut. 17, and 2 Kin. 11. *v.* 12. *Iehoiada the Prieſt gave the booke of the Teſtimony to King* Ichoaſh, *when they made him King, the Prieſts indeed kept the booke of the Law in the ſide of the Arke, but as ſervants of the King, and* cuſtodes Templi.

Vtenbogard cont. Pontific. primat. p. 71, 72, 73 Anto. Wal. p. 2. p. 30, 31. Cabel Iavius apol. diſſer. de l. Eccleſ. c. 6. p. 82. Iac. Trig. Def. Theo.

Anſ. You may ſee ſolid anſwers to this, in *Walens*, *Cabel Iavius*, and *Iac. Triglandius*. 1. The booke of the Law was given to the King for his practiſe, that he *might feare the Lord his God, and his heart not be lifted up above his brethren*, Deut. 17. 18, 19, 20. and this was common to him, with the Prieſts and all the people of God, but to the King in an exemplary and ſpeciall manner, that 1. The people might follow his Example, and therefore theſe ſame words which concerne the practice of the King, *Deut.* 17. 19. are alſo given to the people, *Deut.* 6. 2, and 10. 13. and 11 1, 2, 13, 22. and 12. 1, 2, 28. and 13. 4. and 27. 1. and 28. 1. with a little change, ſure no change that by any conſequent will make the book of the Law to be delivered to the King to this end, that *his lips* by his Royall office, *ſhould preſerve knowledge, and that the people*

The King and the Priest kept the book of the Law, but in a farre different way.

should require the Law at the Kings mouth, which was the speciall office of the Priest, *Mal.* 2. 7. as proper and peculiar to the Priest, as the *Covenant of Levi*, ver. 8. and that they should not be partiall *in the Law, but should teach the people the difference between the cleane and the unclean, the precious and the vile in Judgement, not accepting the persons of father and mother*, Ezek. 44. 23, 24. and 22, 26. Lev. 10. 10, 11, Jeremiah 15. 19. Deut. 33. 9. Yea, it was no lesse peculiar to the Priests, then to offer Sacrifice to the Lord, *Leviticus* 10. 10, 11, 12, 13. Mal. 2. 7, 8. compared with v. 2. and with c. 1. v. 6, 7, 8. Now the King as King was not a confederate in the Covenant of *Levi*, to burne incense and teach the people, but in a farre other Covenant, 2 *Kin.* 11. 17, 18. 2. In which the King was to use the sword in defence of the Law and punishing Idolaters: for 1. the King is neither commanded to teach Priests and people out of the booke of the Law; Nor 2. rebuked for his neglect in this: both these we may read of the Priests every where in the Prophets, *Deut.* 33. 10. *Mal.* 2. 7. *Lev.* 10. 10, 11. *Ier.* 2. 8. and 6. 13, 14. *Hos.* 4. 6, 7, 8. *Deut.* 17. 11, 12. yea the booke of the Law is put in the keeping of the Priests and Levites, *Deut.* 31. 25. *And Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the Arke of the Covenant of the Lord, saying,* 26. *Take this book of the Law, and put it in the side of the Arke of the Covenant of the Lord your God.* Now if the Priests had been onely the Kings servants immediately subordinate to the King, and mediately onely to Iesus Christ, the Arke, all the holy things, the booke of the covenant, *the burning of incense before the Lord*, had been principally and first injoyned to the King. *Ezra* the Priest read the book of the Law, not *Nehemiah*; nor was it ever commanded that the King should read it in the *hearing of the people, and give the sense of it*, as the Priests were to doe by their office; *Hilkiah* 2 *Kin.* 22. *found the booke of the Law that was lost, and* Shaphan *the Scribe read it before the King*, that they might see their Apostacie, and *Iosiah* might accordingly reforme, 2 *King.* 22 9, 10.

Object. 11. *Isai.* 49. *Kings shall be thy Nurse-fathers*: Ergo, *Kings were Fathers and heads of the Church.*

Ans. This text is brought for the Popes Supremacy, but it is *Isai.* 60. 10. *Their Kings* ישרתוּנך *shall serve thee*, this is no dominion. And the breasts of Kings, which the Church is to suck,

is

is not the sincere milk of the Word, which the King preacheth by himself or others, but the externall strength, dignity, that the King shall adde by his Authority to the Church, but the Tutor cannot rob the Pupil of the Law and priviledges of the inheritance. 2. The Prince is not a father spirituall of the second birth of the Church, as *Paul* was, 1 *Cor.* 4. 15.

Object. 12. *He for whom we are to pray, that under him we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlinesse and honesty, and procureth the good of the Church as the Church; to him as the supream Officer and Shepherd, is the Church as the Church subject; but the Magistrate is such,* 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. Ergo.

Ans. The Major is false, and the Assumption untrue also, and all that the conclusion can bring forth, is, that the Prince hath 1. An externall coactive care by way of dominion to procure the removall of Wolves from the fold. 2. To procure the good of the Church, in order to a naturall and civill good. 3. To procure good to the Church as the Church in a coactive way, by the sword, in punishing Idolators. 2. The Church as the Church is not subordinate to the Prince, but as Subjects of the common wealth, because he by a coactive power may procure the good of the Church as the Church; for indirectly and by the sword, the Magistrate defending godlines, and procuring the good of souls, doth not prove that his dominion and sword extendeth to their soules, or *that he watcheth for their soules,* as *Heb.* 13. 17.

Obj. 13. *The Kings of Israel and Iudah have reformed Religion.*

Ans. I cannot trouble the Reader, to adde here what I have answered elsewhere, but let the Reader see *Trigland.*, *Ant. Walens*, *Gabel Iavius* in the cited places, they have in the defection of the Priests, which is extraordinary, Reformed Religion. 2. They did many things as Prophets, not as Magistrates. 3. They have done much in Religion, *quoad actus imperatos, non elicitos*, by their civill power commanding Priests to doe their duty.

Object. 14. *Its true in severall respects, he that is a Governour, may be a subject, but in one and the same spirituall respect, to judge and to be judged, to sit on the Bench, and stand at the barre of Christ Iesus, is as impossible as to reconcile the East and the West together, so The Bloodie Tenent, I demand if the Church be a Delinquent, who shall judge? It is answered, the magistrate. Again if the magistrate be-*

Bloody Tenent, Cap. 82. page 119.

be a delinquent, I ask who shall judge it? It is answered, The Church. Whence I observe (which is, in most cases of the world monstrous) that one person, to wit, the Church or the Magistrate, shall be at one time the delinquent at the Barre, and the judge upon the Bench: for the Church must judge when the magistrate offends; and yet the magistrate must judge when the Church offends, whether she contemne civill authority, in the Second Table for thus dealing with him, or whether she hath broken the rules of the first table of which (say they) God hath made him a keeper and preserver, what blood, what tumults hath been, and must be spilt upon these grounds? Ib. so the Church calleth one of her members to office, and ordaineth him an officer: The Magistrate *opposeth him as an unworthy officer, and according to his conscience suppresseth him; upon this the Church complaineth of the* Magistrates *violation of her priviledges, and that he is turned persecutor, and not prevailing with admonition, She excommunicateth the* Magistrate: *The* Magistrate *again not induring such violation of ordinances, he cutteth off with the sword, such prophaners of ordinances.*

C.65.pa. 123.

C.85.pa. 124.

The Pastors and the Iudges do reciprocally judge and censure one another.

Ans. All this is but wind, devised against the Magistrates punishing of Idolaters, and I shew the same followeth upon the Magistrates, or Church erring, the one in abusing civill authority, or the other in prophaning ordinances, or preaching the word; for instance, The Iudges of a land, or of *Ierusalem*, make grievous and bloody decrees against the poor, the widdows and the Orphane: A faithfull *Isaiah*, a zealous preacher by authority from the Lord, judgeth and condemneth according to his conscience, these judges, and cryeth out, as *Isai.* 10.1 in the name of the Lord, before all the Congregation: *Woe be to you who decree unrighteous decrees, and write* (in the Bench) *grievousnesse, to turne aside the needy from judgement, and to take away right from the poore*: Now the Magistrate that decreed those decrees, judgeth in his conscience they are righteous decrees, and he according to his conscience not induring that *Isaiah* or any preacher should thus abuse and prophane so holy an Ordinance of prophecying, and preaching: as to preach lies in the name of the Lord, he proceedeth in his civill court, and cutteth off with the sword such false Prophets, because they slander the Lords annoynted, and preach lies of him: is not here a reciprocation of judging in the same cause? What will the Author say to this? O saith he, the Magistrate ought not to use his sword against

againſt thoſe Prophets, for they preach according to their conſcience the truth of God: But ſay that *Shimei* were a Prophet, and he calls *David* his Prince a bloody murtherer; and ſaith, this evill is come on him, for riſing up againſt *Saul* his Maſter; The Magiſtrate may not puniſh him with the Sword, for railing againſt the Lords anoynted. 2. And if the Magiſtrate ought not to ſtrike with the ſword any Propher, for preaching according to his conſcience, for that is perſecution to this Author; how ſhall the Prophets judge and condemne the Magiſtrate, for thoſe ſame decrees which he hath given out according to his conſcience? for this is a perſecution with the tongue, *Mat.* 5. 11. *Iob* 19. 22. and it is one and the ſame ſpirituall cauſe, ſaith this Author. 3. The ſame very Author and the Parliament, do reciprocally judge and condemne one another; for the Parliament make warre againſt Papiſts, for drawing the King on their ſide, and cauſing him make warre againſt the Lambe and his followers, that is, againſt godly Proteſtants: Now ſuppoſe Prieſts and Ieſuits, preach this to the Queen and other Papiſts, and they according to their conſcience make warre againſt the flock of Chriſt, and the Parliament according to their conſcience make warre againſt them: this Author ſitteth downe, and judgeth and condemneth both ſides as bloody perſecutors, for point of conſcience: Now though the Author in his Bench with his penne condemneth and judgeth both according to his conſcience; yet if the Papiſts or poſſibly the Parliament, had this Author in their fingers, might not they reciprocally judge and condemne him? I think he cannot deny; how juſtly they ſhould reciprocally judge the Author, I cannot ſay. 3. This Author would have a contradiction, ſuch as is to make Eaſt and Weſt both one, that one and the ſame man both ſit in the Bench, and ſtand at the barre, that the Church judge the Magiſtrate, and the Magiſtrate judge the Church: But I hope contradictions were no more under the Old Teſtament to be admitted, nor under the New. Now in the Old Teſtament the King might put to death the Propher, who ſhould prophecy blaſphemies, and again the Prophet might judge the King, by denouncing the judgement of the Lord againſt the King; let the Author ſay how the King, both did ſit in the Bench, and ſtand at the barre in divers reſpects: I think *Achab* might judge and puniſh *Micaiah* unjuſtly, for propheeying that he ſhould dye at *Ramoth Gilead*, and *Micaiah* might

in

in prophecy give out the sentence of death justly against him; but here be two contrary sentences, the like may fall out in Synodicall constitutions. 2. To answer to his reasons. 1. It followeth not that in one and the same spirituall respect, one and the same person judgeth on the Bench, and is judged at the Bar; for the Churches judging is in a spirituall respect, as the officer ordained, may promote the building of Gods House, the Magistrates suppressing him is no spirituall respect; but as it disturbeth the peace of the State, that so unworthy a person is an officer in Gods House, and is hurtfull to the Church of God in their edification, which the Magistrate is to promote not in spirituall, but in a civill coactive way, by the power of the sword. 3. That one judge on the Bench, and the same stand at the Barre and be judged, at divers and sundry times, is not so impossible, by farre, as to reconcile East and West together; *Achab* may judge *Naboath* to be condemned and stoned for his vineyard to day, and immediately after *Elias* the Prophet may arraigne him before the Barre and tribunall of God to be condemned, and adjudged to dye in the portion of *Iezreel*, where the dogs may lick his blood: It is true *Elias* is not properly a judge, but a declarer, in a propheticall und authoritative way of the judgement of God; but this is all the judiciall power which we ascribe to Church, or Presbytery and Pastors; they are meer Ministers or servants to declare the will and sentence of God: When the Minister preacheth wrath against the King for his sins, he judgeth the King in a Pastorall and Ministeriall way, which is all we contend for, in many officers united in a Church way, and at that same time, the King hath power after that, to judge him for preaching treason for sound Doctrine; if it be found to be treason by the Church, and this reciprocation of judging we maintaine as consistent and necessary in Ministers of Gospel and Magistrates: But such a distance betweene them, as between East and West, we see not. The Author should have shewne it to us by his owne grounds: The Church may excommunicate a Magistrate as a persecutor, who cutteth off Idolaters for their conscience; yet the godly Magistrate may judge and punish them with the sword, for abusing the ordinance of Excommunication, so as to excommunicate the godly Magistrate, because he doth punish evill doing with the Sword, *Rom.* 13.4. 4. The Author infers that tumults and bloods do arise from

those

these two: But that will not prove these two to be inconsistent and contradictorious; tumults and blood arise from preaching the Gospel, what then? *Ergo*, the Gospel is a masse of contradictions, it followeth not: The tumults and blood have their rise from mens lusts, who are impatient of the yoak of Christ, not from these two powers to judge Ecclesiastically in the Church, and to be judged civilly by the Magistrates: The Author draweth his instance to the actuall judging of the same thing contradictory wayes; for example, the Church ordaineth one to be a preacher, and this they do Ecclesiastically, and the Magistrate actually condemneth the same man civilly as unworthy to be a preacher: It is one thing to say, that the Church hath power to judge righteously in an Ecclesiasticall way any matter, and another (that the Christian Magistrate hath power in a civill way, to judge righteously the same matter) and a far other thing it is to say, The Church hath a power Ecclesiastically to judge a matter righteously, according to the word, and the Magistrate hath power to judge the same matter civilly in a wrong and unjust way; the former we say, God hath given a power to the Church to ordaine Ecclesiastically, *Epaphroditus* to be a preacher of the Gospel, because these graces and gifts are in him that are requisite to be in a faithfull preacher; and God hath also given a power to the Christian Magistrate to adde his civill sanction to the ordination and calling of the same *Epaphroditus*: But we do not teach that God hath given to the Church, a power to call *Epaphroditus* to the Ministery in an Ecclesiasticall way, and that God hath given a power to the Christian Magistrate to anull this lawfull ordination of *Epaphroditus*: Now the Author putteth such a supposition, that Church and Magistrate have two lawfull powers toward contrary acts; the one of them a power to give out a just sentence, the other a power to give out an unjust sentence in one and the same cause, which we teach not: God gave to none either in Church or State a power to unjustice, *ad malum nulla est potestas.*

God hath not given a power to the magistrate and Church and to judge contrary wayes, justly and unjustly in one and the same cause.

Obj. 14. *How can the Magistrate determine, what the true Church and ordinances are, and then set them up with the power of the sword? and how can he give judgement of a false Church, false Ministery, false Doctrine, and false Ordinances, and so pull them down with the sword? and yet you say the Magistrate is to give no spiri-*

Bloody Te. c.84.p.122. *rituall judgement of theſe, nor hath he any ſpirituall power for theſe ends and purpoſes.* Bloody Tenent.

Anſ. The Magiſtrate judges of theſe as a Magiſtrate, not in a Paſtorall way or Eccleſiaſtically; for then by office, he ſhould be a preacher of the Goſpel, but civilly as they are agreeable, or contrary to the Laws of the Common-wealth made concerning Religion, and in order to the civill praiſe and reward of ſtipends, wages, or benefices, or to the bodily puniſhment inflicted by the ſword, *Rom.*13.4,5. So, though the object be ſpirituall, yet the judging is civill, and the Magiſtrates power in ſetting up true, or pulling downe falſe ordinances, is objectively ſpirituall or civilly good, or ill (to ſpeak ſo) againſt the duty, or agreeable to that which men owe as they are members of a civill incorporation, a City or Common-wealth: But the ſame power of the Magiſtrate is formally, eſſentially in it ſelfe, civill, and of this world.

CHAP. XXVI. Queſt. 22.

Whether appeals are to be made from the Aſſemblies of the Church, to the civill Magiſtrate, King or Parliament? and of Paul *his appeal to* Ceſar.

FOr the clearer explanation of the queſtion, its poſſible theſe conſiderations may help to give light, 1. There be theſe opinions touching the point: Some exclude the Magiſtrate from all care of Church-diſcipline, 1. As *Ieſuits* and *Papiſts* will have Princes not to examine what the Church, the Pope and the curſed Clergy of *Rome* decrees in their Synods. To theſe the *Sorboniſts* of *Paris* oppoſe, and the Parliament of *France* cauſe to be burnt by the hand of the hangman, any writings of Ieſuits that diminiſheth the juſt right of the Magiſtrate. 2. Thoſe who in the Low-countries did remonſtrate under the name of Arminians, as they are called, hold, that the Magiſtrate ought to tollerate all Religions, even Turciſme and Iudaiſme not excepted, becauſe the conſcience of man cannot be compelled; Some of them were Socinians, as *Henry Slatius*, who

Bellarmine de laicis c. 17.c.18.

ſaith,

saith right downe, he that useth the sword, or seeketh a Magistracy, is not a Christian; yea, war is against the command of Iesus Christ, or in any tearms to kill any; saith *Henry Welsingius, Episcopius* their chief man will have the Magistrate, going no further then reall or bodily mulcts or fines, *Ioan. Geisteranus* pronounceth it unlawfull to be a Magistrate to use the sword: But all say the Magistrate ought not to use the sword against Hereticks, Blasphemers, Idolaters, or against any man, for his conscience or Religion. 3. Those that think the Magistrate bear the sword lawfully, yet do confine him to the defence of the halfe of Gods Law, the duties of the second Table, and not to these all, but to such as border not directly on conscience; for if some should sacrifice their children to *Molech* and Devils, as some do, the Magistrate were not to punish them, it being a joynt of their Religion and a matter of conscience: and all these will be found to give to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, just as little as Iesuits do in the matters of Religion, and that is right downe nothing, except possibly the Magistrate be of their Religion only, whom he Governs only as a Christian man; the Magistrate hath more with these, then with Papists. 4. *Erastus* giveth all in Doctrine and Discipline, both in power and exercise to the Magistrate, even to the dispensing of Word and Sacraments. 5. Others forsaking *Erastus* in a little, But following him in the main, deny power of order. 2. Power of internall jurisdiction granteth to him all the externall government of the Church. 6. We hold that the Magistrate keeps both Tables of the Law, and that he hath an inspection in a civill coactive way, in preserving both Tables of the Law; but that he is not as a Magistrate a member of the Church, but as a Christian only.

Slatius *in aperta declaratione.* p. 53. *Magistratus non valet sub pena eterne condemnationis gladio uti, aut dominatum petere, quisquus id facit, Christianus non est.* Welsing. *lib. de officie homi. Christiani.* p. 1. Sim. Epis. dis. 13. c. 18. 19. Divers opinions of the Magistrates power in causes Ecclesiasticall.

2. *The exercise of Discipline is one thing, and the exercise of it, (as the modus) the way of exercising of it, either in relation to Ecclesiasticall constitutions, or in relation to the politick and civill Laws of a Common-wealth, is a far other thing.*

3. *As the Church is to approve and commend the just sentence of the civill judge in punishing ill doers, but only conditionally in so far as it is just, so is the magistrate obliged to follow, ratifie, and with his civil sanction to confirme the sound constitutions of the Church: But conditionally, not absolutely, and blindely, but in so far as they agree with the Word of God.*

4. *Hence there is a wronging of the Church as the Church, and a civill wronging of the Magistrate as the Magistrate, or of the members of the Church as such, or of the members of the Common-wealth as such, the former and the latter both cannot belong to one judicature:* No more then the failing of a Painter against the precepts of Art, because he hath drawn the colours, proportion, and the countenance beside the samplar, and the failing not against Art, but against the Lawes of the King, in that he hath lavished out too much gold in the drawing of the image, doth belong to one judgement; for the Painter as a Painter, according to the Law of Art, must judge of the former, and the Magistrate as a Magistrate of the latter.

It is one thing to complain to the Magistrate, another thing to appeal. What an appeal is.

5. *An appellation is one thing, and the complaint of an oppressed man is another thing; or a provocation to a competent judge is one thing, and the* refugium, *the refuge and fleeing of an oppressed man to a higher power, is another thing*; if the Church erre and fail against the Law of Christ in the matter, and decree, the man to be a heretick, who is none, and that to be heresie which is truth; the oppressed man in a constituted Church may have his refuge to the godly Magistrate and complain, but he cannot appeal, for an appellation is from an erring judge to an higher judge, in *eadem serie*, in the same nature and kinde of judicatures, as from a civill Court to a higher civill Court, and from an Ecclesiasticall Court to a higher; as suppose the Church of *Antioch* judge that the Gentiles must be circumcised, the godly there may appeal to the judgement of Apostles and Elders, in a Councell conveened from *Antioch* and Jerusalem both: and therefore because the Magistrate can no more judge what is heresie, what truth, as a Magistrate, then he can dispense Word and Sacraments; an appeal cannot be made to him, who is no more a judge, *ex officio*, nor he can dispense the Sacraments *ex officio*, but a complaint may be made to the Magistrate; if the Church fail in their judging, the Magistrate is to command the Church to judge it over againe, but the Magistrate cannot judge it himself; as there is a complaint made to the Magistrate that the Painter hath not drawn the image exactly, according to the samplar, the Magistrate judgeth not of the Art of the Painter; nor can the Magistrate as the Magistrate draw the image himselfe; But the Magistrate may judge of the Painters breach of promise, who did pa-

ction

ction to draw it exactly according to the samplar, and hath not kept faith to the man who payeth him wages; and therefore the Magistrate may either punish his morall error, his breach of promise, not his error of Art, (the faculty or company of Painters must judge of of that) or then command the Painter to paint the same image again, according as the Painter covenanted: But it may be objected, *You then make the Magistrate to meddle no more With matters of faith, and preaching truth or falsehood, and giving out Ecclesiasticall rules in Church government, as* Act.15. *then he meddleth With painting according to the principles of Art; now painting according to Art belongeth not at all to the conscience of the Magistrate, but sound preaching; right ruling in Gods house, belongeth in a far nearer relation to the conscience of the godly Magistrate.* I Answer, As touching the formall judging Ecclesiastically, and as concerning this, that the Magistrate should say, it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to me, or his dispensing of Word and Sacraments, or his burning incense before the Lord, it no more belongeth to him as a Magistrate, to do these in his owne person formally; because God hath not called him to act these, then it belongeth to him to paint an Image, to sew shooes, to sit at the helme of a Ship, and stir and guide her to such a Port, as is clearer, *Heb.*5.4. 1 *Cor.*7.17.21. *Rom.*10. 14. 1 *Tim.*5.17. *and* 3.1,2,3. *Act.*13.23. *and* 20.28,29,30. *Heb.* 13.17. 2 *Chro.* 26.18, 19, 20, 21. But in another consideration, as sound or unsound dispensing of Word and Sacraments, as right or unjust ruling in the house of God, may more or lesse hurt, or benefit the souls of men, which he is to care for indirectly, *in ordine ad penas vel premia civilia et corporalia*; it belongeth more to the Magistrate, to take care of the Church, of Religion, of preaching and governing Gods house, then any painting or Arts in the earth: Again, the Church proceeding in these things, that are against common justice in all judicatures, no lesse then in the Church, as to condemn the party never heard, or not convinced, either by confession, or under two sufficient witnesses, or to do manifest unjustice in the manner of proceeding, leaveth a clear place to the wronged party, by the Law of nature; if not to appeal, yet to flee and have re-course to the Christian Magistrate, who is *Parens Patriæ*, the father of the Common wealth.

Refuge to the Magistrate, is not an appeal.

6. The question may either be of any really wronged by the Church,

Church whether he may appeal to the Magistrate, or whether he who either beleeveth, or thinketh, or falsly lyeth, and saith that he was wronged, may appeal to the Magistrate.

7. An *Appeal* is different from a *Declinature*, a *Declinature* is properly a refusing to be judged, because the judge is incompetent, and the businesse belongeth not to him; those who follow *Erastus*, and deny all power of censures to the Church, doe decline, but not appeal from the *Church*, thinking the *Church* hath no power at all to judge or censure the scandalous. An *Appeal* is properly from the same inferiour judicature, to a superiour judge, *in eadem serie*, in the same kind, and it is either proper or unproper: Proper it is, when a particular *Church* doth appeal to a Synod of many Churches in the same place: Unproper, when either a wronged person hath recourse to one or many Pastors of Authority, as *Chrysostome*, *Flavianus*, *Athanasius* appealed to the Bishop of *Rome*, that he would request the *Church* to proceed orderly: Or, 2. The godly Magistrate would command that the *Church* would unpartially proceed to right an oppressed man, as *Cabeljavius* saith. Or, 3. When there is no Synods to be had, then as *Triglandius* saith well from *Beza*, the *Christian Magistrate* may provide fit meanes of releeving the oppressed.

A twofold appeal.

De Lib. Eccles. c. 9. p. 134, 135. Iac. Trig. de civili & Eccleſiastic. potest c. 20. p. 420. 421.

8. This would ever be remembred, that in case of the Churches erring in judgement, which must be thought of as a sort of extraordinary case, the godly Magistrate may do more, then what ordinarily he can doe; and so may the Church, when the Magistrate oppresseth in judgement, as great *Iunius* saith.

9. We grant when any complaineth to the Magistrate, that they are oppressed in judgement by the Church, that the Church is obliged to give an account of their doings, but that from common charitie to remove the scandall, and that they owe to all Christians, as may be evidently collected from 1 *Pet.* 4. 15. but this will not prove a subordination to common Christians as to Iudges, nor yet to the Magistrate. 2. The Magistrate, when his judging is deemed scandalous, is to give an account to the preachers of the Gospel, who watch for his soul: as King *Saul* gave an account to *Samuel*, (with a false Apologie, I grant) that he had obeyed the Commandement of the Lord; but if *Saul* had been faultlesse in sparing *Agag* and the cattell, yet was he obliged to give an account to *Samuel*.

muel. But that will not prove that King *Saul* was subordinate to *Samuel* to be judged of him, because Prophets are but servants and Ministers to declare Gods will, yet is it all the subordination that we require in this, according to that, *And the people beleeved the Lord and Moses.* Now all the Arguments before alledged to prove that Pastors as Pastors are not subordinate in their pastorall acts to the civill Magistrate, do also prove that there is no appeal from the Church in an Ecclesiasticall businesse to the civill Magistrate: For 1. If two Painters contend touching any controversie in the mysterie of their Art, they cannot appeal to the King as Iudge; the King then should formally be a painter, and which is absurd, not by accident; but as a King and so here, if the King were the judge, to whose determination we might appeale from the Church in a Church controversie, sure the King as King should be a Church Officer: if the Priests in controversie *touching burning incense*, or offering strange fire to God, should appeal to the decision of the King as the King; sure the King in that as King should be an eminent High Priest, and right of burning incense to the Lord, should belong to him, in as farre as the Kings lips in that *controversie should preserve knowledge, and they should seek the Law from his mouth*, which is proper to the Priests, *Mal.* 2. 7. *Ezek.* 22. 26. and 44. 23, 24. *Deut.* 17. 11.

2. The Church of *Antioch* should have appealed to *Cesar*, if he had been a Christian, in the controversie touching circumcision; he should have determined who were perverters of souls, who not, and should have said by his office, as Emperour, It seemed good to the holy Ghost and to me. 3. We have not any practise, or precept or promise in the Old or New Testament, for any such appeal, except they say, all hard questions belonging to the Priests office were to come before *Moses* as a civill Magistrate, and not as the great Prophet to whom God revealed his minde. 4. If so, then all Church controversies in doctrine and discipline, should be ultimately resolved into the will of the Magistrate, speaking according to the word, and faith in most points should come by hearing a Magistrate determining against *Arrius*, that *Christ is God consubstantiall with the Father*, and all binding and loosing in Earth as in heaven, should be from the Magistrate as the Magistrate, he should forgive and retaine sins, and Christ should have given.

given the keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven to the Magistrate as the Magistrate, certainly we should have the doctrine of the *Church* of *Christ*, and the building and edifying thereof most obscure in the *New Testament*, in which there is not one word of such a supream and chiefe officer as the Magistrate. 5. The Parliament, colledge of civill judges, as they are civill Magistrates, should be the Church assemblies, and determine all doctrines, debarre the ignorant and Hereticks, and Apostates from the Sacraments, and totally cast them out of the Church and excommunicate them; I see not but then the Parliament as the Parliament is the Church, and the two Kingdomes, *Joh.* 18. 36. must be confounded, and no difference at all made between the civill state and the Church, because the Magistrate as the Magistrate is made by the adversaries the chiefe officer over the Church, the Ecclesiasticall head, the mixt Governour, halfe civill, whole Ecclesiasticall, in whose power all Pastors, Elders preach, dispense Sacraments, make Church-canons, as his Ministers and Servants; Christ when any brother trespasseth against a Christian brother saith, Tell the Church, never, Tell the christian Magistrate. But truly it is a great mistake in the learned Mr. *Pryn* to call them *Anti-Monarchicall, Anti-Parliamentary, and Novators*, who deny that the Parliament hath any Nomothetick power in Church-canons. Nor hath hee in any measure answered the Arguments of those Learned and godly Divines, Mr. *John Goodwin*, and Mr. *Hen: Burton*; he is pleased to cite the practise of many Parliaments of *England*, who laudably impatient of the Popes yoke, have made *Church-canons*, when the man of sin sate upon the neck of the Christian church; but these numerous citations of Parliaments and Councels in time of Popery conclude nothing against us, who grant when the Church is not her selfe, the christian Magistrate may extraordinarily reform and take from the man of sin his usurped power, but in a constituted *Church* the case must be otherwise: and 1. *Whereas he proveth Emperors and Kings to have a power to convocate Councels*; It hath not strength against us, all our Divines teach so. But how, 1. an accumulative civill power, so *Iewel, Alley, Bilson, Whitaker, Willet, White, Roger*, he might have cited more; but no privative, no Ecclesiasticall power, so as Synods may not lawfully conveen without the command of the civill Magistrate.

Mr. *Pryn* his Truth Triumphing sect. 2. and 3. p. 7, 8, &c.

gistrate; our Divines say many Synods and Church meetings were in the Apostolique Church without the consent and against the will of the civill Magistrate; our Divines oppose the Pope, who claimeth the only accumulative, civill, privative, and Ecclesiastick power to convocate Synods, and that no Synods are lawfull without the consent and mandate of the holinesse of such a Beast.

2. Master *Prinne* saith, *The Magistrate hath power to direct, for time and place, and to limit for matter and manner, the proceedings, liberty and freedome of all Church Assemblies*: But, 1. he asserteth this in the most; from corrupt practises. 2. He proveth, *Laymen should have hand as well in Synods, as Clergymen, the one having interest in the faith, as well as the other.* *Ans.* Then must all the people be members of Synods, for all have alike interest of Faith: but this proveth not interest of defining, which is the question; in dispensing Word and Sacraments, they have interest of trying all things, as well as Pastors: but it followeth not; *Ergo*, they may dispense Word and Sacraments, no lesse; yea, more principally then Pastors, as *Erastus* saith, the Magistrate more principally determineth Synodicall constitutions: Hence this is easily answered, *We may appeal in Church businesse to him as to the supream judge, who may punish the erring Church and Pastors; but the Magistrate may in Church businesse do this*: For answer, 1. I retort it, the Magistrate in making civill Lawes, that must in their moralitie be determined by the Word of God, may appeal to Pastors, whose lips by office should preserve knowledge; *Ergo*, the Magistrate in making civill Lawes, may appeal to the Pastor, which is absurd. 2. If men in Church-constitutions may appeal to the Magistrate, as to one who may in his person determine Synodically in Assemblies above all the Pastors, 1. Because Magistrates may punish the Pastors erring and oppressing in Synods. 2. Because the Magistrate and all laymen have interest in the faith, as well as Pastors, then may people in hearing the Word and receiving the Sacraments, and in all Pastorall rebukings and threatnings, in believing of all Gospel promises and threatnings, and fundamentall truths, appeal from Pastors to Magistrates as Magistrates, and Magistrates as such may determine all fundamentall truths, all conscionall promises and rebukes; and that is, formally they may preach, (for he that can distinguish these hath a good engine) Because Magistrates may punish

i6. Sect.13, 14,15,16.

Prinne. Truth Triump. p.31.

The Magistrates punishing, or his interest of faith proveth him not be a judge in Synods.

hereticall preaching, and superstitions, and idolatrous abusing of the Sacraments by preachers, and Magistrates and all Laymen have interest of Faith, in Word, Doctrine, and Sacraments, as in Discipline; yea, the Magistrate may punish the Priest that offered strange fire to the Lord, offered bastard incense; and the people had their interest of faith, in sacrifices offered for their own sins: but can it follow, therefore the Magistrate might sacrifice and burne incense in his own person, as Mr. *Pryn* will have him to make Church-laws in his own person: Other Arguments of Mr. *Pryns* are light; as, *that there were brethren, and Lay-men that had hand in the Councell at Hierusalem*, Acts 15.

Truth triumphing, sect. 2. 31, 32.

Ans. This is nothing for Magistrates as Magistrates, but all Christians as Christians so must have hand in Synods, which I grant in so far as concerneth their faith and practise, that they *try all things, and try the Spirits whether they be of God or not*; but will it follow, *Ergo*, Magistrates as Magistrates are those only who govern the Church, and make all Ecclesiasticall constitutions, as having in them all power of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and deriving it to Bishops and Pastors at the second hand, as Mr. *Pryn* saith in the same booke.

Obj. *But the King is head of the Church*; Ergo, *he maketh lawes to regulate the Family.* Page 31.

Ans. The Antecedent is false, if not blasphemous; it is proper to *Iesus Christ* only, *Col.* 1. 18. *Eph.* 1. 22. The King is the head *of men*, who are the Church *materialiter*, he is not formally as King, Head of the Church as the Church; and therefore we see not how this Statute agreeth with the Word of God, *Henric.* 8. *Stat.* 37. *c.* 17. *The Archbishops, Bishops, Arch-deacons, and other Ecclesiasticall persons have no manner of Iurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, but by, under, and from the Kings Royall Majesty, the onely and undoubted supream head of the Church of* England *and* Ireland, *to whom by holy Scripture is given all authority and power, to hear and determine all manner of causes Ecclesiasticall, and to correct all vice and sin whatsoever*; for neither is the subject, the *Archbishops, Bishops*, &c. lawfull, nor is the limitation of the subject lawful; for Ecclesiasticall officers are the Ambassadors of Christ, not of the King.

Page 32. Obj. *All Christians are to try the Spirits*; Ergo, *Much more Magistrates.* *Ans.*

Ans. This proveth that Christians as Christians, and Magistrates as Christians, may judge & determine of all things that concerneth their practise, and that they are not with blinde obedience to receive things; Mr. *Pryn* cannot say, that 1 *John* 4. 1. is meant of a Royall, Parliamentary, or Magistraticall tryall, *John* speaketh to Christians as such: But this is nothing to prove the power of the Magistrate as the Magistrate; for though the man were neither King nor Magistrate, he ought to try the Spirits, 1 *John* 4.1.

Of *Pauls* appeal to *Cesar*, that it proveth not that in Ecclesiasticall controversies we may appeal to Heathen or Christian Magistrates as to Iudges of matters Ecclesiastick, from the Church.

The speciall objection moved for Appeals is, *that which* Paul *did in a matter of Religion, that we may do in the like case, but* Paul Acts 25. *did appeal from a Church Iudge to a civill and a heathen Iudge, in a matter of Religion, when he said before* Festus Acts 25. *I appeal to* Cesar; Ergo, *so may the Ministers of Christ far more appeal to the Christian Magistrate, and that* Paul *did this* jure, *by Law, not by Priviledge, but by the impulsion of the Holy Ghost, is clear, in that he saith, He ought to be judged by Cesar*; so *Maccovius*, so *Videlius*, so *Vtenbogardus*, so *Erastus*.

Ans. 1. This Argument, if it have nerves, shall make the great Turk, when he subdueth people and Churches of the Protestant Religion, to be the head of the Church; and as *Erastus* saith, by his place and office as he is a Magistrate, he may preach and dispense the Sacraments, and a Heathen *Nero* may make Church constitutions, and say, *It seemed good to the holy Ghost and to me*; and by this, *Nero* by office is to excommunicate, make or unmake Pastors and Teachers, judge what is Orthodoxe Doctrine, what not, debarre hereticks, Apostates and mockers from the Table, and admit the worthie; and *Paul* the Apostle must have been the Ambassador and Deputie of *Nero* in preaching the Gospel, and governing the Church, and *Nero* is the mixt person, and invested by Iesus Christ with spirituall jurisdiction, and the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven. This Argument to the Adversaries cannot quit its cost, for by this way *Paul* appealed from the Church in a controversie of Religion, to a *Nero*, a Heathen unbaptized Head of the Church, and referred his faith over to the will, judgement, and determination of a professed Enemy of the Christian Church; and *Paul* must both *jure* by the Law of God, and the impulsion of the Holy Ghost, appeale from the Church to a Heathen without the Church, in a matter of Religion

ligion and Conſcience; then *Nebuchadnezzar* was head of the *Church* of *Iudah*, and ſupreame judge and governour in all cauſes and controverſies of Religion; how can we beleeve the adverſarie, who doe not beleeve themſelves? and ſhall we make *Domitian*, *Diocleſian*, *Trajan*, and ſuch heads of the Church of Chriſt?

2. It is not ſaid that *Paul* appealed from the Church or any Eccleſiaſticall judicature to the civill judge; for *Paul* appealed from *Feſtus* who was neither *Church* nor *Church officer*, and ſo *Paul* appealeth from an inferiour civill judge, to a ſuperiour or civill judge, as is clear, *Acts* 28. 6. *And when* Feſtus *had tarried amongſt them more then ten dayes, he went downe to* Ceſarea, *and the next day ſitting in the judgement ſeat, commanded* Paul *to be brought*, verſ. 10. *And* Paul *ſaid, I ſtand at Ceſars judgement ſeat, where* I *ought to be judged; he refuſed*, v. 9, 10. to be judged by *Feſtus* at *Ieruſalem*, but ſaith, *v.* 11. *I appeal to Ceſar*: Now he had reaſon to appeal from *Feſtus* to *Ceſar*, *for the Iewes laid many grievous complaints againſt* Paul, *which they could not prove*, verſ. 7. And it is ſaid *verſ.* 8. *That* Feſtus *was willing to doe the Iewes a pleaſure*, and ſo was manifeſtly a partiall Iudge; and though the Sanedrim at *Ieruſalem* could have judged in point of Law, that *Paul* was a blaſphemer, and ſo by their Law he ought to die, for ſo *Caiphas* and the Prieſts and Phariſees dealt with Ieſus Chriſt, yet his appeal from the Sanedrim, 1. corrupted, and having manifeſtly declared their bloodie intentions againſt *Paul*. 2. From a Sanedrim in its conſtitution falſe, and degenered far from what it ought to be by Gods inſtitution, *Deut.* 17. 8, 9, 10. it now uſurping civill buſineſſe, which belonged not to them; *Paul* might alſo lawfully appeal from a bloodie and degenerating Church judicature, acting according to the bloodie luſts of men againſt an innocent man, to a more unpartiall judge, and yet be no contemner of the Church; this is nothing againſt our Theſis, which is, that it is not lawfull to appeal in a conſtituted Church, from a lawfull unmixt Church Judicature to the civill Magiſtrate in a matter of life and death. 3. *Paul* appealed from the Sanedrim, armed with the unjuſt and tyrannicall power of *Feſtus*, a man willing to pleaſe the bloodie accuſers of *Paul*, as is clear, *v.* 9. *And* Feſtus *willing to doe the* Iewes *a pleaſure, anſwered* Paul *and ſaid, Wilt thou go up to Ieruſalem, and there be judged of theſe things before me?*

Paul appealed from an inferiour civill judge to a ſuperiour civill and heathen judge, in a matter of his life, not in a matter of Religion.

Religion

3. The

3. The cause was not properly a Church businesse, but a crime of bodily death and sedition; I deny not but in *Pauls* accusation, *prophaning of the Temple, teaching against the Law of Moses* was objected to him. *Materialiter* the enemies made the cause of *Paul* a Church businesse, but formally it was sedition. 1. It was a businesse for which the Sanedrim sought *Pauls* life and blood, for which they had neither authority nor Law by divine Institution, therefore they sought the helpe of *Felix*, *Festus* and the *Roman Deputies*; so *Lysias wrote to Felix*, Act. 23. 29. *I perceived* Paul *to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing layd to his charge worthy of death, or of bonds:* Now it is clear the *Roman Deputies* thought not any accusation for the Iewish Religion a matter of death and bonds, and therefore *Gallio* the Deputie of *Achaia*, Acts 18. 14. saith to the Iewes, *if it were a matter of wrong and wicked lewdnes, O yee Iewes, reason were that I should bear with you.* 15. *But if it be a question of words and names, and of your Law, looke yee to it, for I will be no judge of such matters*; *Ergo*, to the Romans, all the blasphemies of the Iewish law was not a matter of wicked lewdnesse, nor of death: Now the story is clear, they were seeking *Pauls* life, and for names and words, the Iewes should not reach *Paul*, nor move the *Romans* to put to death a Roman, except they could prove sedition or treason against him; and *Acts* 25. *Festus* saith to *Agrippa*, *That the Priests and Elders desired to have judgement against* Paul. 18. *But against him they brought no accusation of such things as* I *supposed.* 19. *But had certain questions against him of their owne Superstition, and of one Iesus, who was dead, whom* Paul *affirmed to be alive:* Here it is clear, all are but words, nothing *worthy of death*, which the Iewes chiefly intended; therefore they accuse him of treason, as we may collect from *Pauls* Apologie, *Acts* 25. 8. *Neither against the Law of the Iewes, neither against the Temple, nor yet against Cesar have* I *offended any thing at all.* Therefore *Act.* 24. *Tertullus* a witty man burdeneth *Paul* with that which might cost him his head, *v.* 5. *For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, a mover of sedition amongst all the Iewes, throughout all the world*, see *Acts* 21. 38. of all which, though blasphemy according to the Iewish Law was something, yet sedition to the *Romans*, who only now had power of *Pauls* life, was all and some; and when the Deputies counted so little of Religion, the

Iewes

Iews knew sedition and treason against *Cesar* behooved to do the turn, and *Paul*, seeing they pursued him for his life, appealed to *Cesar* to be judged in that. Now, except the adversaries prove that *Paul* referred the resurrection of Iesus, and of the dead, and his preaching Christ, and the abolishing of sacrifices, the Temple, the Ceremoniall Law, to be judicially determined by *Nero* as by the head of the Church, they prove nothing against us: Hence their chiefe argument is soone answered, *in what cause* Paul *was accused of the* Iews, *in that he appealed to* Cesar: *But he was accused not for his sedition, but for his Doctrine*, Act. 26. 18. Ergo, Paul *appealed to* Cesar *in the cause of Doctrine, not of sedition*: For, 1. The Major is dubious, for in what cause he was accused of his head, which was the intent of the Iews in that he appealed, true; but in what cause he was accused, in all and every Article of the points of his accusation and challenge, I deny that; for as touching doctrinals, and his being judged by a lawfull Church, and rightly constituted, he appealed neither from the *Sanedrim*, nor from *Festus*, but declined *Festus*, nor in these did he appeal to *Cesar*; he only appealed in all cases, which might concern his head and blood. 2. The assumption is false, for he was accused of sedition, as is evident from *Act.* 25.8. and 24. 5. 3. Though the Priests and Elders were most corrupt men; yet that they believed, that *Cesar*, or bloody *Nero* his lips should preserve knowledge, and that the Law should be sought from the mouth of *Nero*, as the head of the Church, can never be proved, which must be proved to justifie *Pauls* appeal in the tearms of the adversary.

Obj. *But may not* Nero *accuse* Paul, *that he dare preach his Iesus Christ in the Emperours dominions?*

Ans. If his dominions be the Christian Churches conquered by his sword, he may accuse as he conquered, that is, he may oppresse the consciences of men in accusing, as he oppressed them in their bodies and liberties in the conquering of them: But he may not as a conquerour accuse them for their conscience, he may if he conquer those that worship Sathan, cause instruct them in all meeknesse and lenity: But this he doth by the sword as a Christian ruler, to inlarge the dominions of Christ; for when he conquereth their bodies, it is not to be thought that he conquereth their souls, or acquireth any new dominion over their consciences: But though he

What power a conquerour hath to set up a religion in a conquered nation.

he do as a Magistrate command them to be instructed, I doubt if he have a negative voice in imposing any Religion that he will, though they be heathens, though some learned Divines say he have a definitive voice, in setting up what Religion he will or tollerating it; I conceive, though he have a definitive voyce in erecting the only true Religion in his heathenish dominions, when there be no Ministers of the Gospel there; yet not for any false Religions, that being of perpetuall truth, *God never gave authority or power of the sword to do ill, ad malum non est potestas:* what other things *Videlius* and *Vtenbogard* have on the contrary, are answered: Hence we ask, 1. If the intrinsecall end of judging and censuring Ecclesiastically, be not the inlightning of the mind, the gaining of souls; and if *Nero*, or Christian, or Heathen Magistrates, be appointed for that spirituall end? 2. If *Paul* aymed to refer the judging of the Gospel to *Nero*? 3. If *Paul* knowing the *Sanedrim* sought his blood, not the gaining of his soul, might not appeal to the Magistrate to save his life? 4. If it was not the Law of natures dictate in *Paul* so to do, and not any positive constitution of the Magistrates Headship over the Church and Gospel? 5. If the Ecclesiasticall judicature will swell without its sphere of activity, to dispose of the life and blood of the Saints; if then the state of the question be not changed; and if then it be not lawfull to appeal and decline, and provoke to the civill Magistrate?

Videlius de Episcopat. Constant. p. 77.
Vtenbogard. p. 33.

4. Moreover *Paul* appealed not to *Cesar, in ordine ad censuram aut penam Ecclesiasticam*, in order to a Church-censure, as if he thought *Cesar* should principally excommunicate and cast him out of the Synagogue, or judge him in an Ecclesiasticall way, whether he had done or preached against the Temple, and Law of *Moses* or not, which must be proved, if the adversaries will prove a proper appeal from the Church to the Prince, which is now our question. All this which is our mind is well explained by our Countryman *Ioh. Camero. prelectio*, in *Mat.* 18. 15. p. 151. *Christiani principes sunt precipui in Ecclesia in sensu diviso, sunt precipui et sunt in Ecclesia, non in sensu conjuncto, non sunt precipui Ecclesiastici: Non enim obtinent principes directe authoritatem Ecclesiasticam, sed indirecte, non quod velimus ulla in causa ullum eximi jurisdictione principis, sed quia ejus jurisdictio non nisi per media Ecclesiastica pertinet ad conscientiam, nempe, princeps non predicat Evangelium, non ligat et solvit peccatores*

peccatores, at de officio principis est dare operam, ut sint qui predicent Evangelium, ut sint qui ligent et solvant peccatores, uno verbo perinde principis est curare salutem animarum, ac eiusdem est saluti corporum prospicere, non est enim principis providere ne morbi grassentur directè, esset enim medicus, at indirectè princeps id studere debet, Itaque Collegium Magistratuum nullo modo Ecclesia dici potest, imo quatenus Magistratus est de Ecclesia, subjicitur hac in parte Collegio Ecclesiastico neque tamen ista inter se pugnant, idem ut imperet Collegio Ecclesiastico, et pareat idem, imperat enim quemadmodum medico imperat Rex, paret ut medico, nam si medicum facientem officium morte multet, non faciet quod decet sapientem principem, sed quod faciunt furiosi et insani, sin venificum afficiat extremo supplicio, faciet quod jus et fas, et quod non facere nefas esset. Sic impii reges et insani prophetas jusserunt interfici, pius Rex et idem sapientissimus David Nathanem exosculatus est, Ceterum accipiatur Caute parendi verbum, Rex enim cum senatui Ecclesiastico paret, non paret illi obedientia civili quæ Collegium respiciat, sed obedientia Religiosa que deum respiciat. Sic qui lictori misso a senatu parebat non parebat lictori, sed senatui. Yet it cannot be denied, but the same *Camero* ascribeth more to the Magistrate then is due, for there is no reason why he saith the Prince obeyeth the Church unproperly, more then the people; for it is the same obedience that Prince and people yield, 2. He denieth that the Magistrate and Pastors differ in their end and object, but only in the way and means leading to the end; and in the same doth that learned Divine *Dav. Pareus*, though both be against the *Erastian* way: for they say the Magistrates end and object, is not only peace and the good of the body, and of the externall man, but also of the soul even a supernaturall good, the eternall salvation of men, because the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* were to read the book of the Law, and they only did reform Religion: Ans. This doth prove that the Church-teachers and Magistrate differ not in the materiall object and end, (of the Iewish Kings I adde nothing to what I have answered before) but in the formall end and object they differ: Its true, I have said that the intrinsecall end of the Magistrate is a supernaturall good: But, 1. That I speak in opposition to the Author of the bloody Tenent, to Socinians, and such as exclude the Magistrate from all meddling with Religion, or using of the sword against

Camero. prelect. in Mat. 16. v. 18. 19. Tu es petrus. p. 17.

Due right of Presbyteries. p. 435 436. 437 438. &c.

againſt Hereticks, Apoſtates, and Idolaters. 2. That I underſtand only of the materiall end, becauſe the Prince puniſhing Idolatry, may *per accidens*, and indirectly promote the ſalvation of the Church, by removing the temptations of Hereticks from the Church; but he doth that, not in order to the conſcience of the Idolater, to gain his ſoul, (for Paſtors as Paſtors do that) but to make the Church quiet, and peaceable in her journey to life eternall: but all this is but to act on the externall man by worldly power.

But ſaith *Camero, it is not true that the Church muſt meddle with every ſin that is ſcandalous; becauſe for the circumſtance it may be ſo hid, that the Church cannot judge it, eſpecially in a matter of fact: A Phyſitian killeth a man either of temerity or negligence, there is no queſtion but it is a great ſin; yet the tryall of this belongeth not to the Church: ſo the Paſtor may exhort the Magiſtrate to do his duty, but to give judgement what way the King ſhould do this, and when he ſinneth in this, belongeth to him who governeth the Common-wealth; for this muſt be true*, credendum eſt artifici in ſua arte, *You muſt believe every man in his owne Art and calling, otherwiſe great confuſion ſhould follow.* Camero, 16, 17.18.

Anſ. Obſerve that *Camero* doth liberate the Magiſtrate from being ſubject to the rebukes of Paſtors, but by accident; becauſe the ſins of Princes are hidden in the dark obſcurity of intricate cauſes which they judge: But ſo the ſins of Painters and tradeſmen are hid, becauſe judges ſee not the myſteries of trades. This is no Argument, but ſuch as will equally prove, that the poyſoning of a Kings ſon, belongeth not to the King and Parliament; for a medicinall and phyſicall trying, how the Phyſitian killeth a man, doth properly belong to the Colledge of Phyſitians; and if it belong not for this phyſicall reaſon to the Church-court, becauſe it is not their Art to judge of medicinall potions, no more ſhall it belong to the civill judge to try this murther by poyſon: for as Paſtors as Paſtors are not Phyſitians, and ſo cannot judge of the fact; ſo Kings and civill judges, as ſuch, are not Phyſitians, and cannot judge for circumſtances of a fact of inceſt, murther, parricide, and of all ſins acknowledged to belong to both Church and Magiſtrate, in divers reſpects, may make the fact equally dark to all. 2. It is true Paſtors cannot preſcribe what way the Magiſtrate ſhould judge; but if the Paſtors cannot determine *in hypotheſie*, that this is a fact

of unjustice in a judge, and so rebuke, but *credendum artifici in sua arte*, we must believe the judge in his owne Art, he saith this is an art of justice: then *Isaiah* and *Ieremiah* should not cry out against unjust decrees, against crushing and oppressing the poor in the gate; because the wickedst judges say, all their decrees are just, they defend the fatherlesse and widow, and do not crush them, and Pastors cannot rebuke the sins of unjust judges, but you must believe they do just and right in their owne art; yea, many villanies and scandals are carried so mysteriously, and in the clouds, that we must believe the sinner in his owne art and trade of sinning, and believe the harlot, who wipeth her mouth and saith, I have not sinned. For the practice of *Constantine* the Great, in the cause of *Donatus* and *Cecilianus* I remit to *Eusebius* l.10.c.5. to *Optatus Melivitanus* who wrote the History of the *Donatists* carefully, to *Augustine* Epistle 162. and for the determination of the question, see what the Emperour writeth to the Councell of *Nice*, *Zozome* l.1. c.16. *Ruffin.* l. 1.c. 2. *Eusebius in vita Constant*, *Deus vos constituit sacerdotes et potestatem vobis dedit de nobis quoque judicandi et ideo nos a vobis recte judicamur, vos autem non potestis ab omnibus judicari, propter quod Dei solius inter vos exspectate judicium*, &c.

There were no appeals made to the godly Emperors of old.

ὑ μεῖς μὲν ἐπὶ τ ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ τῶν ἐκτος ὑπὸ θεῦ καθισάμενος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην.

That *Nectarius* was chosen and ordained Bishop of *Constantinople* by *Theodosius Socrates* l.5. c.8. saith not, but by the contrary a *centum et quinquaginta Episcopis qui tum aderant ordinatus*. *Theodoretus* l.5. c.8. saith he was designed Bishop by the Synod of *Constantinople*: Antiquity seemeth dubious in it, for *Nicephorus* l. 12. c.12. *Zozomen.* l.7. c.8. *Theodoretus*. l.5. c.9. *Historia tripartit.* l.9. c. 14. say that the Emperor ordained him, the Synod named him; the truth is, the Bishops were devided in judgement; and its like they referred the matter to the godly Emperour: In the mean time *Athanasius* Epist. *de solit vita*, *Ambros.* l.5. *orat ad auxentium*, and l.5. Epist.32. *ad valentinianum. Zozomen* l.6.c.7. *Concilium Toletanum.* III. *Concilium milevitanum.* and divers others which I have cited elsewhere, make the Emperor a Son of the Church, not a Head and Lord, *intra Ecclesiam, filium Ecclesiæ, non judicem, non dominum supra Ecclesiam*: I might adde *Augustin*, Epist. 48. 50. 162. l.1. *de doctr. Christ.* c.18. *Cyril. Alexandrinus* in an Epistle to the Synod of *Antioch*, all Protestant Divines of note and learning.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII. Queſt. 23.

Whether the ſubjecting of the Magiſtrates to the Church and Paſtors, be any papal Tyranny; and whether we differ not more from Papiſts in this, then our adverſaries? The Magiſtrate not the Vicar of the mediator Chriſt: The Teſtimonies of ſome learned Divines on the contrary anſwered.

IT is moſt unjuſtly imputed to us, that we lay a Law upon the conſcience of the Magiſtrates, that they are bound to aſſiſt with their power, the decrees of the Church; taking cognizance only of the fact of the Church, not inquiring into the Nature of the thing.

To lay bands on the conſcience of the Prince to tye him to blind obedience, Popiſh, not our Doctrine.

This Doctrine we diſclaim, as Popiſh and Antichriſtian: It hath its riſe from *Bonifacius* the III. who obtained from *Phocas* a bloody tyrant, who murthered *Mauritius* and his Children, as *Baronius* confeſſeth: and yet he ſaith of this murtherer *optimorum imperatorum veſtigia ſequutus*, he made an Edict that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould not be called *Oecumenick* nor univerſall Biſhop; but that this ſhould be given only to the Biſhop of *Rome*: So *Baronius* yieldeth, this tyranny was inlarged by *Hildebrande*, named *Gregorius* the ſeventh, a monſter of tyrannicall wickedneſſe, and yet by Papiſts, he is *ſanctitate et miraculis clarus*, *Baronius* extolleth him, theſe and others invaded both the ſwords: Biſhops would be civill judges, and trample firſt upon the neck, then upon the conſciences of Emperors, and make Kings the hornes of the beaſt, and ſeclude them from all Church buſineſſes, except that with blind obedience, having given their power to the beaſt, as ſlaves they muſt execute the decrees of the Church. *Paul* the III. the confirmer of the order of Ieſuits, who indicted the *Councell of Trent*, as *Onuphrius* ſaith, upbraideth *Charles* the V. for meddling with Church buſineſſe: They write that Magiſtrates do not ſee in Church matters with their owne eyes, but with Biſhops eyes; and that they muſt obey without examining the decrees of Councels; and this they write of all ſubject to the Church, *Toletus* in *Inſtruct*

Platina. in Bonifac. 3.
Baronius an. 602. n. 18.
Baronius. an. 606. n. 3.
Baroni. an. 1085.
Onuphorius an. 1527. 1540.

struct Sacerdot. l.4.c.3. *Si Rusticus circa articulos fidei credat suo episcopo proponenti aliquod dogma hereticum, meretur in credendo, licet sit error. Card. Cusanus excit.* l.6. *sermon. obedientia irrationalis est consumata et perfectissima obedientia sicut Iumentum obedit domino.* Ib. *sententia pastoris ligat te, pro tua salute, etiam si injusta fuerit*: Envy cannot ascribe this to us, *Calvin*, *Beza*, yea, all our writers condemne blind obedience as brutish: But our Adversaries in this are more Popish, for they substitute King and Parliament in a headship over the Church, giving to the King all the same power in causes Ecclesiastick, that the Pope usurped. 2. They make the King a mixed person, to exercise spirituall jurisdiction, to ordaine Bishops, and deprive them; and Mr. *Prinne calleth the opinion of those who deny Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, legislative* (a high word proper to God only) *coercive power of Christian Emperors, Kings, Magistrates, Parliaments, in all matters of Religion,* (what, in fundamentall Articles of salvation?) *Church-government, Discipline, Ceremonies,* &c. *Anti-monarchicall, Anti-parliamentarie, Anarchicall, as holden by Papists, Prelates, Anabaptists, Arminians, Socinians,* &c. Its that which Arminians objects to us, and calleth the soul, heart, and forme of papall tyranny.

Mr. *Prinne* Truth triumphing. *Remonstr. in apolog. p. 299. esse papatus corculum, esse id ipsum in quo sita est forma papatus, sive papalis hierarchias.*

But that the Magistrate is not obliged to execute the decrees of the Church, without further examination; whither they be right or wrong, as Papists teach that the Magistrate is to execute the decrees of their Popish councels with blind obedience, and submit his faith to them; because he is a layman, and may not dare to examine, whether the Church doth erre, or not, is clear; 1. Because if in hearing the word, all should follow the example of the men of *Berea*, not relying on the Testimony of *Paul* or any preacher; try, whether that which concerneth their conscience and faith, be agreeable to the Scriptures or no, and accordingly receive or reject; so in all things of Discipline, the Magistrate is to try by the word, whether he ought to adde his sanction to these decrees, which the Church gives out for edification, and whether he should draw the sword against such a one as a heretick, and a perverter of souls: But the former is true, the Magistrates practise in adding his civill sanction, and in punishing heresies concerneth his conscience, knowing that he must do it in faith, as he doth all his moral actions; *Ergo*, the Magistrate must examine what he practiseth

in

in his office, according to the word, and must not take it upon the meer authority of the Church; else his faith in these moral acts of his office should be resolved *ultimatè* on the authority of the Church, not on the word of God, which no doubt is Popery; for so the warrant of the Magistrates conscience, should not be, Thus saith the Lord, but Thus saith the Church in their decrees. 2. The Magistrate and all men have a command to try all things; *Ergo*, to try the decrees of the Church, and to retain what is good, 1 *Thes.* 5. 21. To try the spirits even of the Church, in their decrees, 1 *Joh.* 3. 1. 3. We behooved to lay down this Popish ground, that 1. The Church cannot erre in their decrees. 2. Its against Scripture and reason, that Magistrates, and by the like reason, all others should obey the decrees of the Church with a blinde faith, without inquiring in the warrants and grounds of their decrees, which is as good Popery, as, Magistrates and all men are to beleeve as the Church beleeveth with an implicite faith, so ignorance shall be the mother of Devotion; who ever impute this to us who have suffered for non-conformity, and upon this ground that Synods can erre, refused the Ceremonies, are to consult with their own conscience whether this be not to make us appear disloyall & odious to Magistracy in that which we never thought, far lesse to teach and professe it to the world. 4. Their chiefe reason is, the Magistrate by our doctrine, by his office, is obliged, 1. To follow the judgement of the Church, and in that he is a servant or inslaved, *Qui enim judicia aliorum sequi tenetur, is non regit, sed regitur, adeoque servus est, & mancipium brutum eorum, quorum judicium sequi obligatur*, and the Magistrate (say they) as such, is neither to judge nor try what the Church decrees, but as a Burrio, or Hangman to execute that which the Church hath decreed. But 1. I put it in forme, and retort it thus, *They are servants and slaves who are obliged not to despise, but to hear and obey, and so to follow the judgement of the Prophets, the faithfull Pastors of Christ, preaching the Word of God soundly and Orthodoxly.* Remonstr. in apolog.

But not onely Magistrates, but all within the visible Church are obliged, not to despise, but to hear and obey, and so to follow the judgement of the Prophets, the faithfull Pastors of Christ preaching the Word of God soundly and Orthodoxely; Ergo, *Magistrates and all within the visible Church are slaves and servants.*

But

But the conclusion is absurd; *Ergo*, some of the premises, but the Assumption is the word of God, *Iudah was carried captive, because they would not hear the Prophets rising early in the morning and speaking to them:* Also in the New Testament, this is true to the second coming of Christ, *He that heareth you, heareth me, he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* And this, *He that will not obey the servant of the supream Magistrate, in that wherein he is a servant, and holdeth forth the Lawfull commands of the supream Magistrate, he will not obey the supream Magistrate:* The Major proposition is the adversaries, the assumption is expresse Scripture; let them see then to the conclusion. 2. When the adversary shall answer this argument with equal strength made against preaching and hearing the word, they will answer their owne argument made against Church-government. 3. This argument is made against Synods Popish, that cannot erre; as our Protestant Divines object; and therefore the adversarie is Popish here, not we: Thus they are servants and slaves who are obliged to follow the judgement of Councels absolutely, without limitation; and because they say it, whether they warrant their decrees by the word of God, or not, that is a true Major proposition: But now the assumption is most false, for neither Magistrates nor any other, are to follow the judgement of the Church absolutely without limitation, and because they say it. The other part is, they are servants and slaves, who are to follow the judgement of the Church and Councels, with a reserve, and a condition, and limitation, in so far as they agree with the word; now the Major is false.

2. *He that is obliged to follow the judgement of another, does not rule, but is ruled*, true, in that in which he followeth the judgement of another; the Magistrate in so far as in matters of Religion, that concerneth his conscience, faith, and practise, he followeth Pastors; he is not a ruler formally to those whose judgement he is obliged to follow: But in civill matters he may be, and is a ruler to those same; for we answer to Papists who by this same argument would prove, that Churchmen are not subject to the Magistrate, nor to civill Laws: *He that is a sheep, is not to rule and command his shepheard; but the Magistrate is a sheep and a member of the Church, and Pastors and Doctors are shepheards: We answer,* in divers considerations a Magistrate as a Magistrate in civill things, is

So *Stapleton, Bellarmine* and other Papists argue.

is not ruled by Paſtors and Doctors, but he is to rule them: But a Magiſtrate as a member of the Church, as a Chriſtian in things that concerneth his conſcience, is a ſheep and to be ruled, not a ruler to Paſtors and Doctors, and ſo here; and therefore, *non concluditur quod eſt τὸ κρινομένον.*

3. The adverſaries are to anſwer this alſo; for if Paſtors and Doctors be as ſuch, but ſervants under the Magiſtrate; and if he have that ſame *Architectonica poteſtas*, that ſame ſupremacy and headſhip in Eccleſiaſticall matters, as in civill matters, to command alike in both by the ſame power: Then, 1. The Paſtors and Doctors are obliged to follow his judgement, without appeal or examination, and they are ſervants and ſlaves, and ruled, and not περισσεύοι not over the Magiſtrates as Chriſtians, neither over the people in the Lord. 2. The Elders as Elders, are not to examine what the Magiſtrates as Magiſtrates command in Eccleſiaſticall matters or in Religion, they may poſſibly not as Elders but as as Chriſtians, judge with the judgement of diſcretion, as all other Chriſtians may do; For *Videlius*, *Eraſtus*, and other Adverſaries ſay, *the Magiſtrate may not command what he pleaſeth; for in Church matters he may command but according to the rule of the Word, and in civill matters according to equity, juſtice, and prudence.* True: But, 1. The Magiſtrate as ſupream head of the Church, is by office, to judge what government of the Church is moſt agreeable to the word, what is ſinfull, Antichriſtian, and tyrannicall; and the Magiſtrates lips in thus judging, as he is a Magiſtrate, and not the Paſtors are to preſerve knowledge; and both Paſtors as Paſtors, and the people as members of the Church, and as they may worſhip and ſerve God in this government, or may ſin, are to ſeek the Law at the Magiſtrates mouth, and directions for their conſcience from him, as from a Magiſtrate, and not as from a Chriſtian, not from Paſtors as Paſtors that handle the Law. And if the government as a way of ſerving God, may be preſcribed and held forth to the conſciences of all by the Magiſtrate as the Magiſtrate; by the ſame reaſon all the wayes of God, in which the Church of *Epheſus*, *Pergamus*, *Thyatira*, may ſo approve themſelves to Chriſt, and as he is to walk in the midſt of the Golden Candleſticks, and as a Magiſtrate, he is to forbid ſuch ſins in Government, as may procure the removing of the Candleſtick; and why may he not by the ſame

reaſon,

reason, hold forth to their conscience all the other parts of the Gospel? If any say, *Who can deny but the Magistrate as the Magistrate may command that which is obedience to Christ, and reward it, and forbid sin and punish it?*

The Magistrate as a Magistrate cannot forbid sin as sin.

Ans. But the Magistrate as such, forbiddeth not sin as sin, for then as a Magistrate he should forbid sin under the punishment of eternall wrath, which he cannot do as a Magistrate, he onely can forbid sin under the pain of his temporary punishment, which he can inflict, and as it disturbes societies, and incorporations.

Obj. *The Magistrate as the Magistrate shall not serve Christ as Mediator, if he doe not command the dispensing of Word and Sacraments, as they are spiritnall meanes leading us to a supernaturall end, and if he forbid not Idolatry and blasphemie against Christ as they are sins, and Gospel sins done against Christ, as Mediator.*

The Magistrate as the Magistrate promoteth Christs mediatory Kingdom materially, not directly and formally.

Ans. I utterly deny this consequence: For 1. the Magistrate may serve Christ as Christ, and promote and advance the Kingdome of Iesus Christ as Mediator, when he contributes his power to those things that materially conduce to a supernaturall end, though he doe not contribute any thing that formally conduceth to such an end. 2. So you may say a *Christian Husband* as a *Husband*; a godly *Physitian*, as a *Physitian*, a Printer who printeth the Bible, do nothing serviceable to *Christ* as *Christ*, and in promoting Christs Mediatory Kingdom, when the one begetteth children, that being borne in the visible Church are made heires of the Kingdome of Christ; and the other when by his Art and skill he preserveth the life of a godly and zealous Preacher: The third, when by his Art he publisheth in print the Testament of Christ; the Physitian doth somewhat as a Physitian that is serviceable to Christ as Mediator, yet (I hope) it is no Ecclesiasticall businesse to restore to health a godly Minister; nor to beget a child who is made an heir of Grace, nor to print the Bible; so a Philosopher as a Philosopher doth convince one that worshippeth bread, that the man leaveth his error, and this is materially service to Christ, and a promoting of *Christs* Mediatory Kingdom; but neither *Husband, Physitian, Printer* or *Philosopher*, are in these acts, the Vicars and Deputies of *Iesus Christ*, as the Magistrate is holden to be by the Adversary: Nor 2. do they as Ecclesiasticall persons formally advance the kingdom of *Christ* as do the preachers

of

of the Gospel, far lesse more principally do they advance *Christs Kingdom*, as the Magistrate is supposed to do. Nor 3. hath their thus promoting of Christs Kingdom any influence upon the conscience as the Magistrate must have, if he forbid sin as sin; now the Magistrate as such, doth nothing to promote formally the mediatory Kingdome of *Christ*, for he may doe, and doth all hee doth as a Magistrate; yea suppose he were a Turk set over Christians as their Magistrate granting that *Christ* was a true Prophet, yet may he as a Magistrate, punish those who shall teach that Christ was a false Prophet and an impostor, and though his Magistraticall acts be serviceable to Christ *materially*, yet not *formally*. 1. Because this Magistrate denieth *Christ* to be the Saviour of the world, and yet as a Magistrate he justly punisheth the man that blasphemously calleth *Christ a deceiver, and an impostor*. 2. Because as a Magistrate he believeth him not to be God, and so *ex intentione operantis*, he punisheth him not for a wrong done to *Christ* as *Christ*, and as the Saviour of mankind, but as a wrong done to the common wealth, and as a disturber of the peace thereof; Hence these Propositions touching the Magistrates relation to the Mediator *Christ* and his Church.

The Magistrate as such not the Vicar of the Mediator Christ.

Propos. 1. The Magistrate as a Magistrate is not the Vicar nor Deputie of Iesus Christ as Mediator; 1. Because this is the heart and soul of Popery, that the Papists teach that Christ as Mediator hath left a temporall, an earthly and visible Monarch as his Vicar on earth. Now that learned and singular ornament of the Protestant Churches, *Andreas Rivetus* hath well said, *Christ hath instituted neither Kings nor Princes in the Church as his successors, nor any Vicars with a domination, but onely Ministers and Servants; who are to discharge their Embassage, in the Name of the onely Prince Christ; for an Embassage cannot institute other Ambassadors, either Kings or Princes, but onely Ministers, who do serve, not reigne in the Kingdom of Christ, he himselfe onely reignes; the Servants of this great King promote the Kingdom of their Prince,*

The adversaries in the doctrine of the Magistrate Popish, not we at all. *Andreas Rivetus Iesuit. Vapul.* in Castigati Notarum in Epist. ad Balsacum Edit. 1644. c. 11. page 40. *Christus neque Reges neque principes instituit in Ecclesia, sed neque successores habet, neque vicarios quibus competat jus dominatus, ministros tantum instituit, nomine principis unius legatione, legatio autem neque legatos, neque reges, neque principes, constituit legatos, sed ministros qui serviunt, non regnant. In regno Christi solus ille spiritualiter regnat; servi summi Regis, regnum sui principis promovent, nec unquam sibi usurpant regalia jura.*

nor do they ever usurpe the royall power. Yea, all the arguments of *Protestants* that are brought to prove that the *Pope*, a *Bishop*, and a *Church man*, because he is a Bishop and a Steward in the *Church*, and in Christs spirituall Kingdom that is not of this world, cannot be an earthly Prince and Monarch having power either directly or indirectly *in ordine ad spiritualia*, to dispose of Kingdomes and crownes, and enthrone and dethrone Kings, doe also prove that the King cannot be head of the Church, nor the Magistrate an Officer of the Church. Doe not Protestant Divines condemn that blasphemous speech of *Cardinall Bertrandus*, that Christ who was a temporall Lord on earth, should not seem a discreet and wise Prince, if he had not left a Temporall Vicar behinde him in the Church, and that of *Armacanus to be false, that Christ by birth was the true King of Iudea*, and so a Temporary Prince, hence (say they) there should be a temporary Prince, and an earthly Monarch, the successor of Christ as King and Mediator. This *Becanus the Iesuite* maketh a speciall ground of the Popes Headship of the Church, and for this *Suarez* disputeth; yea, the Iesuite *Ægid. Conninck* saith, *It is the common and received opinion of all the (Romish) Doctors, that Christ as man hath a true Kingly power, and a direct dominion over all the Kingdomes of the world, to give them lawes, and to exercise all Kingly power over them, though* de facto *he abstained from it*; and is not upon this pillar builded the Popes Supremacy? and that which *Augustinus de Ancona* saith, *Idem esse dominium dei & Papæ*, it is the same dominion which *God and the Pope hath, because it is the same jurisdiction of the Ambassador, and of the Lord who sent him*? I deny not, but many Papists give to Christ an indirect Kingly power, and to the Pope they give the same indirect power *in ordine ad spiritualia*, as *Vasquez*, and *Pet. Waldingus* and others; but this we say; if Iesus Christ forbid a preacher of the Gospell remaining a preacher to be a civill Magistrate or *temporall Lord*, as he doth both by precept and and practise, *Luke* 22. 24, 25, 26. and 12. 13, 14. *Ioh.* 18, 36. and 6, 15. then upon the same ground he must forbid the civill Magi-

Cardinall *Bertrandus tract. de Orig. jurisd. q. 4. n. 5. Non videretur discretus dominus (ut cum reverentiâ ejus loquar) nisi unicum post se talem vicarium reliquisset qui hæc omnia posset; Armacan, l. 4. quæst. Armen. c. 16. Becan. tom. 2. opuscul. Suarez tom. de incarnat. Christi disp. 48. sect. 2. Ægid. Conninck. de incarnat. disp. 23. dub. 5. n. 43 p. 697.*

Communior itaque doctorum sententia, Christum etiam quâ hominem habere veram potestatem regiam, ac directum dominium in omnia regna mundi, &c. *August. de Ancona, de potest Papæ, q. 1. art. 1 quia est eadem jurisdictio delegantis & delegati,* Coninck. tom. de incarn. disp. 23. dub. 5. *Vasquez tom. de incarnat. disp. 87. c. 2. & c. 6. Pet. Wald. de incar. dis. 11. de adop. & dominio Christi, dub. 5. n. 50, 51.*

strate to be a *Church Governour*, as if God should forbid a Physitian to be a Painter, (because the two callings cannot lawfully consist in the person of one man) he should also forbid a Painter to be a Physitian; then the Arguments against a *Monarchy and Magistraticall power in the Bishop of Rome*, must fight against any Ecclesiasticall power in a Magistrate, if then the Pastors doe as Pastors, rebuke, exhort, excommunicate, and censure, as directly subordinate to the Magistrate, then Pastors as Pastors discharge their office as inferiour and under Magistrates, and so they partake in so farre of a temporall dominion, being direct instruments under Temporall Lords; and if the Magistrate as the Magistrate doe command them to dispense Word, and Sacraments and discipline, and make and unmake Pastors, and regulate and limit them, and make Lawes to them, then the Magistrate as the Magistrate doth partake of an Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and both are forbidden by Christ in the places cited. 2. If the Magistrate be the onely supream Church Governour under Christ, the government of the Church must be a visible Monarchy, and the Magistrate must have both the Swords, Temporall and Spirituall, and Christs Kingdom must be of this world, and the weapons thereof carnall to fight for Christ, and the supream Church-officer as such must bear the Sword, be a valiant man of warre by office, and Christs Kingdome must be not of this world, and the weapons thereof not carnall, but spirituall, *Joh.* 18. 36. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5. and the supream Church-officer must be no striker, no fighter, no man of war, no sword-bearer by office, which are contradictory. 3. We prove the Pope to be no Vicar of Christ, because we read not in the Word of any such Vicar, nor do we read any thing of a supream *Church-officer*, who is the Vicar of *Christ*. 4. No spirituall Ambassador as such, can substitute other Ambassadors with Majority of power, that he hath in his Name to dispense Word, Sacraments, and Discipline; nor can one great Ministeriall *Church-head* create lesser Ministeriall *Church-heads*, such as Justices, Majors, Sheriffes, Bailiffes, Constables, no more then the High Priest could substitute in his place other little High Priests, if he were sick and absent, to goe into the Holy of Holiest with blood once a yeere, no more then the Apostle *Paul* immediately called of God can substitute other lesser Apostles immediately

Pastors are made inferiour Magistrates by the adversaries in their whole Ministery.

called of God to act as lesser Apostles, but limited by the higher, in the exercise of power; nor can these lesser *Apostles* create other *Apostles* yet lesser, and these in a subalternation yet lesser, while you come as low as a *Constable*, as the King doth send lesser Kings indued in part with his Royalty or Iudges under him, and those Iudges may appoint other Iudges under them; and because the whole visible Catholick Church hath an externall visible policy, if *Oecumenick* councels have any warrant in the word, then ought Christ to have instituted one civil Emperour over all the Churches on earth, to conveen *Oecumenick* Synods, to preside in them, to limit and regulate them, to make Lawes to all the world; and that this is not, it falleth out through mans corruption, but it ought to be according to divine institution, no lesse then every single Magistrate is by institution the head of every particular Church, indued as our adversary say with that supream power under Christ the mediator, that they call *Potestas Architectonica*, the headship of the Church.

The Magistrate as such not the vicar of the mediatory kingdome.

Propos. 2. The Magistrate as such is not a Vicar of Christs mediatory Kingdom, 1. Because then as the Magistrates are called Gods אלהים in Scripture, *Exod.* 21.6. *Psal.* 82. 1 *Ioh.* 10.34,35. so the Magistrates should be called little Mediators, or submediators, between God and man; little Kings of the Church, little Priests, little Prophets of the Church: for God giveth his name to Magistrates, because he communicateth also to them some of his Majesty and power; now what mediatory, what Princely, Priestly, or Propheticall power hath Christ communicated to Magistrates as Magistrates: *Erastus* saith, *they may dispense Word and Sacraments, if they had leasure*: But if they be by office, little mediators, and Pastors under Christ, they should take leasure; for every Magistrate ought to say, *Woe be unto me if I preach not*: And Master *Coleman* saith, *that Christian Magistracy is an Ecclesiasticall administration*; he must speak of Christian Magistracy formally, as Christian Magistracy, otherwayes a Christian Tentmaker, a believing fisher was an Apostle; if he mean that Christian Magistracy is a Church officer formally, he might say, it is a Mediatory office, and a Princely and Kingly office under Christ, to give repentance to *Israel* and forgiveness of sins instrumentally; would Master *Coleman* teach us how the Magistrates sword *openeth the eyes of the blind*,

Brotherly re-examination, pag. 20.

Christian Magistracy no Ecclesiasticall administration.

blind, converteth men from the power of Sathan to God, begetteth men through the Gospel to Christ, as Pastors do; and that formally as Magistrates, we should thank him. 2. Christian Magistracy, if it be a Church or Ecclesiasticall administration, then is it formally so either as Magistracy, or as Christian; not as Magistracy, for then all Heathen Magistrates must formally, *hoc ipso*, that they be Magistrates, be Ecclesiasticall persons: so *Nero* when *Rome* makes him Emperour, they make him formally a Church-officer; and invest him with power to dispence Word and Sacraments, and Discipline, if he might find leasure for killing of men, and such businesse, so to do; for *quod convenit ἢ αὐτὸ convenit κατὰ παντός* where doth the Old or New Testament hold forth such an office given by Christ, as a fruit of his ascension to heaven? Where do the Apostles who shew us the duty of Magistrates, Fathers, Masters, Pastors, Teachers, Rulers, Deacons, Husbands, insinuate any such office? If as Christian, Christian Magistracy be an Ecclesiasticall office and administration: Christianity, 1. Is common to the Magistrate with all other professors, Painters, Merchants, Seamen, Lawyers, Musitians; and no more can Christianity make a heathen formally a Church-officer, then it can make a Painter formally a Church-officer? can faith in Christ, and professing thereof make any to be formally Church-officers? then must all be Church-officers that are Members of the Church, for *posita causa formali ponitur effectus formalis*: Now Master *Coleman* saith, The heathen Magistrate as a Magistrate is an Ecclesiasticall administration; *because (saith he) he should, and ought to manage his power for Christ; as the heathen and uttermost parts of the earth are given for Christs possession and inheritance, and Christ hath given no liberty to a great part of the world, to remaine infidels and enemies to him and his Government*: I *suppose Christ hath all Nations given to him, and all Nations ought to receive Christ, though as yet actually they do not; God and Nature hath made Magistrates, and these Magistrates thus made, God hath given to Christ*: But, 1. The title of Christian added to Magistracy, by this is superfluous, and put in only *ad faciendum populum*, for Christianity maketh no man formally a Magistrate by M. *Colemans* way; yet saith he *pag.* 17. *a Christian Magistrate as a Christian Magistrate, is a Governour in the Church*: he should say by his way, a Magistrate Christian as a Magistrate, is a Governour

Mr. *Coleman* re-examination, pag. 1

not

not only in the Church, but a Governour of the Church.

Arg. 2. If the Magistrate as the Magistrate be the Vicar and deputy of Christs mediatory kingdom, then all and every Magistrate as Magistrate by his office, is obliged under the pain of Gods wrath, to command that the Gospel be preached, and that men believe and obey Christ as mediator, in all his dominions; that so he may manage his office for Christ: But the latter is utterly false, and contrary to the Gospel; *Ergo*, so is the former. The Major is undeniable, all service that Magistrates by office do, they sin before God, if they do it not; and so must be obliged under the pain of sin, and Gods wrath to do it: And therefore are obliged to command that the Gospel be preached, and that men believe and obey Christ, if by office they be the Vicars and deputies of the mediatory Kingdom. I prove the assumption, These Magistrates amongst the *Americans* and other Heathen, who never by any rumour heard of Iesus Christ, are essentially and formally Magistrates: But neither are they obliged to command that the Gospel be preached, nor their people they are over, obliged to believe and obey Christ as mediatour; because only those to whom Christ and the Gospel commeth, can be guilty of not receiving Christ the mediator, and of not promoting the mediatory Kingdome: Such Magistrates are obliged only with their sword to glorifie God the creator, and to punish sins against the Law of Nature, nor are they guilty for not punishing the not receiving of the Gospel, or for sins against the mediator, of whom they never heard; for this is invincible and insuperable ignorance, and can make no man guilty, who never heard nor could hear of the Gospel, according to that, *Ioh.*15.22. *If I had not come and spoken to them, they should not have had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin*, Rom.2.12. *For as many as have sinned without Law, shall also perish without Law, and as many as have sinned in the Law, shall be judged by the Law*; Ergo, they that never heard of the Gospel or the mediator, cannot perish, nor be judged for refusing the Gospel; and it were strange, if Magistrates were invincibly ignorant of their office, which is to set up the mediator Christ and his Church and visible Kingdom, if yet they never heard, nor ever could hear of the Word of the Kingdom; for then to do and performe the duties of their office, should not only morally, but invincibly and physically be impossible, and so they should not be obliged to do the duties of their office.

Heathen Magistrates as such are not obliged to promote Christs mediatory kingdom.

Obj.

Obj. 1. *When the Heathen Magistrate is converted to the faith, and becometh a Christian Magistrate, he is obliged by his office as a Magistrate, to command his people to honour and receive the Lord Jesus, and the Ministery of reconciliation, and to punish such as blasphemeth the mediator Iesus Christ, such as* Arrians, Antitrinitarians, *and others*; Ergo, *that officiall obligation lay on him before as a Magistrate: for you say that the heathen Magistrate turning Christian, acquireth no new Magistraticall power by turning Christian, which he had not before while he was a heathen Magistrate; onely Christianity maketh him use the officiall power of a Magistrate, which he had before, while he was a heathen ignorant of Christ, now for the honour of the mediator Christ, and the promoting of his mediatory Kingdome.*

Ans. 1. The Antecedent is denied, for when the heathen Magistrate is converted to the Christian faith, he is not obliged by his office, as a Magistrate to command his people (whom we suppose now to be hearers of the Gospel, and possibly converted also) to believe and professe Christ, nor is he obliged as a Magistrate to promote the mediatory Kingdome of Christ, as his mediatory and spirituall Kingdom (he or his sword have nothing to do with spirits or consciences as they are such, nor with the subjects of a spirituall Kingdom) nor can he punish blasphemers of Christ as such: nay, nor can he punish such as sin against God the creator, as they sin against God the Creator, by vertue of his office of a Magistrate, for so formally he commandeth obedience to Christ mediator, or to God creator, and punisheth sins and blasphemies against the mediator, or against God the creator only as such obedience and such blasphemies, may promote the externall safety, prosperity, and peace of the civill society, whereof he is head, or may dissolve the sinnues and nerves of that society. What he doth to uphold that society which is a part of Christs redeemed Kingdome, he doth it as a Magistrate in a far other Notion then the Pastors and teachers, who by office as spirituall watchmen, are to promote Christs mediatory Kingdom, as such a spirituall incorporation professing union with Christ the head of the body the Church.

Obj. 2. *But yet it will follow that the heathen Magistrate remaining heathen, is invincibly ignorant of his office; for in so far as he remaineth a heathen, he cannot promote the mediatory Kingdom*

of

of Christ in any Notion; nay, not so much as it is a mean conducing to the externall safety and peace of that civill society, whereof he is head; Ergo, *he must, while he remaineth an heathen, and never by rumor heareth of the Gospel, be by office a promoter of Christs Kingdom, and by office a punisher with the sword, of all such as blaspbem the mediator Christ, though through his owne sinfull ignorance he cannot put forth in acts or exercise the very officiall and Magistraticall power, which he hath by office, and* actu primo, *while he remaineth an heathen Magistrate.*

Ans. 1. It followeth not that the heathen Magistrate, being ignorant (while he remaineth in that state) of some acts, which would conduce to the peace and externall safety of the State, if the state were Christian, that he is invincibly ignorant of his office; to be unable to exercise some acts of an office not consistent with an heatheniſh state, can never argue invincible ignorance of the office. 2. The consequence is nought, that because he is ignorant of some acts, and cannot exercise them; that therefore the heathen Magistrate remaining heathen, is by office, and *actu primo*, an officer and vicegerent of Christs mediatory Kingdom: for at no time, and in no state, hath the Magistrates sword any influence in the mediatory Kingdome at all, but in so far as the sword may procure externall peace to the society of that Kingdome as they are a civill body, which peace he might by office procure by other means then by commanding the Gospel to be preached, or by punishing such as blaspheme Christ: for though the materiall object of the Magistrates sword be the spirituall Kingdom of Christ, yet the formall object is the naturall and civill peace of this Kingdome as a civill society, for to promote spirituall means, and to punish spirituall sins, such as heresie and blaspheming of Christ, do often conduce very much for civill peace. 3. It is false that the heathen Magistrate is unable to exercise his magistraticall power for the mediator Christ through his owne sinfull ignorance, his not knowing Christ of whom he never heard, is not any sin at all, nor is he obliged to know or believe in him, of whom he never heard, *Rom.* 10.14.

Magistracy from the Law of nations.

Arg. 3. Every Magistrate is ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις *an humane Ordinance*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. and is appointed by God the creator, and by a rationall Nature, yea saith Mr. *Coleman, God and Nature made Magistrates*

Magistrates, he must mean God the Creator and Nature, but I hope God as creator, and Nature made not the Magistrate the head of the *Church*, the Vicar of the Mediator *Christ*, this must have its rise from a higher fountain then Nature; *Ecclesiasticall Offices* tend to a supernaturall end, *Magistracy and humane Laws* (saith *Suarez*) *is from Nature*, and the Law saith, *de jure gentium est omnis principatus.* That excellent and learned Lawyer, *Ferd. Vasquius* saith, *That all Princedome hath its rise from the secondary Law of Nature*, to wit, *à jure gentium, from the Law of Nations:* Hence *Kings, Princes, Parliaments, Iudges, Lord justices, Majors, Sheriffes, Constables*, &c. in their root are naturall, but in particulars, Rulers are from the prudence of humane societies, there is a higher institution for Church-officers, *Eph.* 4. 11. they have not their rise from Nature, and therefore that *Celebrious and renowned Antiquarie, D. Salmasius* in that learned work of his, *De primatu papæ* condemneth the dignity and jurisdiction of *Patriarchs above Metropolitans*, as *flowing from the Writs of Princes, and Synodical constitutions of Fathers, not from any Divine Institution*, the highest was as *Theodoret* saith, ἐκ τῶν κανόνων τιμῆς. Now God as creator and Nature doth not, sure Nature cannot appoint a Vicar of *the Mediator Christ*, for if the Magistrate be *an Ecclesiasticall administration, then it must be an office intrinsecally supernaturall*, and intrinsecally and directly tending to a supernaturall end; now the *Papists* for shame doe build their *head of the Church* upon a *divine institution*, and on Christs words, *Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and I will give to thee the keyes of the Kingdom of heaven*; Christ never said any such thing to a Magistrate; *and if the Magistrate be an Ecclesiasticall administration*, and the *head of the Church*, and the Vicar of Christ as Mediator, he must have more then this, and the keyes of the Kingdom of God must be given to him above *Peter* and all the Apostles, for all Church-officers act their part as such, *à & sub Magistratu, from and under the Magistrate, as his Vicars*, so as the Magistrate in *America* who lived and died never hearing of the Gospel, nor of his Lord Mediator, is yet by office the Vicar of the Mediator, and obliged as a Magistrate though a meer heathen to beleeve in him of whom he never heard, if the adversary say right, which is unpossible, *Rom.* 10. 14. But saith Mr. *Coleman, If Christ*

Suarez to. 1. de legi l. 5. c. 3. qui dat formam, dat consequentia ad formam. l. 2. in prin. f. de instit. & jure cod. tit. c. jus nat. 1. dispitem dominium est jus quoddam l. fin. ad med. c. de long. temp. prestit. l. qui usum fert.

Ferd. Vasq. illust. quest. l. 1. c. 41. n. 28, 29.

D. cl. Salmasius de primatu Papæ par. 1. cap. 14. page 60. eam (jurisdictionem Patriarchalem) omnem haud minus quam ipsi Metropolitani, aut rescriptis principum, aut sanctionibus patrum Synodalibus, acceptam referant oportet, non ulli institutioni divinæ.

be rightfull King of the whole earth, where did Christ grant a liberty to a great part of the world, to remain Infidels and enemies to him and his Government?

Arg. 4. In Answer to which, I draw a fourth Argument; All the Heathen Magistrates who never heard of the Mediator Christ and the Gospel, cannot by office be the Deputies and Vicars of the mediatory Kingdom, for they are not the professed subjects of Christ as Mediator, nor given to him *as his possession and inheritance*, neither actually, nor in Gods decree; for thousands of them lived and died without Christ or any obligation to beleeve in, or serve the Lord Iesus as Mediator, for if Christ be not their rightfull King as Mediator, nor their King at all as Mediator, they cannot be his subjects as Mediator, far lesse can they be his Deputies and Vicars by office of his Kingdome; but Christ is not King as Mediator in any sort or title of such as are Heathen Magistrates, for as Mediator he is neither King, *titulo & jure acquisitionis*, nor *efficaci applicatione*, neither *merito*, nor *efficacia*, he neither gave a price as Mediator to buy them, because the adversaries then must say, that Christ is so King of the whole earth, as he hath died for all and every one of mankind: nor are they his subjects so much as in the profession of the word of his Kingdom, for they never heard it; if the Adversaries can say that Christ died for all and every one of mankinde, and so for these Heathen Kings, I can refute this Article of Arminianisme; and though Christ had died for them, yet are they not subjects in so much as in profession, and so in no capacity nor obligation to serve with their sword, Christ as Mediator, for they are not in that state obliged to beleeve in him, nor to know him as Mediator; how then are they obliged by office to serve him as Mediator, except he had revealed himself to them in the Gospel? Hence I need not prove that Christ is their King by efficacious applying of the merits of his death to them, nor can any say this Argument may prove that Pastors by office are the Ambassadors of Christ, because they are not all the subjects of Christ given to him as Mediator, either in the decree of Election, nor actually redeemed; for many Pastors who are by office the Ambassadors of Christ as Mediator, are Reprobates, as was *Iudas* and others; for the Argument is not drawn from any saving claime that heathen Princes who never heard of Christ

The Adversaries must teach universall Redemption.

hath

hath to Christ, but it is drawn from no claim at all, no not so much as in profession; now this claim in profession all Pastors have, else they cannot be Pastors.

It is doubtsome that Master *Coleman* saith, and not to a purpose, That Christ granteth not a liberty to the greatest part of the world, to remain infidels and enemies to him and his Government: For thus he giveth them a liberty negative, so as they are not obliged to believe a Gospel that they never heard, nor is their negative infidelity a sin, for which they are condemned: they are condemned, *Because they glorifie not the Creator as God*, Rom.1.21. *And do not the things of the Law, that are written in their hearts*, Rom.2.12. 14. Mat.25.42,43,44. And in this sense God giveth to them liberty to remain infidels, but he giveth them not liberty positively to remain infidels and enemies to Christ, that is, he willeth not *voluntate signi*; that they should live in a sinfull course of unrenewed nature; but they are not positively enemies to Christ and to his Government, who never by the least rumour heard of Christ or his Kingdom or Government: Hence all our Divines say, that privative unbeliefe of those that hear the Gospel, doth condemn, but not the negative unbeliefe of those who never heard the Gospel: Thus the adversaries must say, except they with Arminians, and especially with *Moses Amyrald* teach, That there be two wayes of preaching Christ, and two sorts of faiths in Christ, one of those that hear the Gospel, and another of those who are to believe in Christ, though they never hear of, or know any letter of the Gospel, who yet by the book of creation and providence are obliged to believe in Christ, which were an irrationall obligation, *Rom.*10.14.

*Arg.*5. All power mediatory in Heaven and in earth, that is given to Iesus Christ as Mediator, is all spirituall, all Ecclesiasticall power; and therefore Christ upon this receipt of all power, *Mat.* 28.18. draweth a conclusion, *v.* 19. Πορευθέντες οὖν, *&c. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations*, &c. but a Kingly power of this world by carnall weapons, and by sword to fight, is not given to Christ mediator; for he denieth expresly, *Ioh.* 18.36. that he hath such a Kingdom as Mediator, or that he was instructed with the sword as Mediator, *Luk.* 12.13. Now as God and Creator of the world, Christ could not deny but he had a Kingdom worldly, and that he hath a *regnum potentiæ*, an universall Kingdom of power, as Lord of

Hoasts; to dispose of all the Kingdoms of the world, and to rule amongst the children of men, and to rule over the children of men, and to give them to whomsoever he will, *Dan.* 4. 25. & 8. 18. *Ier.* 27. *v.* 6, 7, 8, 9. *Psal.* 24. 1. *Psal.* 50. *v.* 12. Nor is this Kingdom and Power given to Christ, nor is he made Prince and a King as God; but as Mediator to give repentance to the House of *Israel*, and forgivenesse of sins, *Act.* 5. 31. I grant it is said, *Phil.* 2. 9. *God hath highly exalted Christ, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Iesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and of things in earth, and things under the earth.* What? *doth not this* (say the adversaries) *comprehend a royall power given to Christ? and hath not Christ from this power to substitute Magistrates in his place, as his vicars under him, and as little mediators?* I answer, it doth in no sort follow: for that is a spirituall power, as is clear, *Rom.* 14. *v.* 9. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of dead and living*, v. 11. *For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confesse God:* So it is clearly expounded of Christs exalting at the right hand of God, *Act.* 5. 31. for spirituall and supernaturall ends, I grant as Mediator and King he breaketh his enemies, Devils, and men, *Psal.* 2. 9. *With a rod of yron, and dasheth them in pieces like a potters vessel, and maketh his enemies his footstool*, *Psal.* 110. 1. But that is no carnall power, such as earthly Kings useth, it is a spirituall power, for the reason is given, *ver.* 2. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Sion*: By which *v.* 5. as a great Anti-royalist, *He strikes through Kings in the day of his wrath*: Now Christ as Mediator sendeth not out Kings and Princes to conquer souls to him with their sword: Renowned *Salmasius* saith, *When Christ sent his Apostles first to preach the Gospel, and to lay the foundation of the Christian Church, did he send out with them* lictors, pursevants, *men of war with a bundell of rods, and with axes to compell men to come in to his Kingdome? Commanded he to smite them with swords and axes, who would not receive the Gospel? No, yea he would not have them to take with them a staffe, a scrip, or shoes:* But though Christ subdue all his enemies, Devils, and wicked men, it shall never follow that Christ is for that, King and head of Devils, and wicked men: For Christ is as Mediator King and Head, or mediatory King and Head of those that are the subjects,

Cl. Salmasius de primatu papæ, 1. Part. in apparatu, p. 148. 149. nullum jus in corpora habuernat ut Magistratus civiles, sed animarum curam gerebant ut veri pastores docere, pascere munera fuere spiritualia longè diversa ab imperio, potestate & jurisdictione Magistratuum.

jects, and redeemed conquest of this King, and of those who are members of the body of which he is Head, now this body is his Church only, *Col.* 1.18. *He is the Head of the Body the Church*, Eph. 1. 22, 23. *And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, Which is his Body, the fulnesse of him that filleth all:* The Body of *Christ to be edified*, Ephes.4 12. *Till we all* (all that body of the Saints to be perfected, *v.* 11.) *come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulnesse of Christ*, v.16. *from whom the whole Body fitly joyned together, and compacted by that which every joynt supplieth, according to the effectuall working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body unto the edifying of it selfe in love*: Now never Divine can say, that Devils and wicked men, who shall bow to Iesus, are the subjects of this Kingdom of Christ, who have right to the fruits of the Kingdom, *Righteousnesse and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*, Rom.14.17. far lesse that they are of the Body; that is, Christs Body, Christs fulnesse, Christs Body to be perfected, edified, to *Come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man*, &c.

Arg. 6. These Magistrates that are the mediatory vicars, deputies, and heads of the Head Iesus Christ and his Kingdom, these are of his Body, and subjects under the King and Mediator Christ, the chiefe Head and King: For it is not to be presumed, that Christ will appoint these to be heads and vicars of his Body, and little Kings over his Kingdom, as he is Mediator, who are not members of his Church, nor subjects of his mediatory Kingdom: But Magistrates as Magistrates, are not members of his Church, nor subjects of his mediatory Kingdom: no more then Husbands as Husbands, Fathers as Fathers, are members; and their should have been Husbands and Fathers, though the Lord Iesus never had been Mediator, advocate, and Priest of a redeemed Church.

Magistrates as such not members of the Church.

Obj. *But are Pastors and teachers, and Elders as such, members of the Christian Church?*

Ans. If eyes and ears be members of the body, and watchmen members of the city, then are they, *ex officio*, by their office members of the Church: But if the Magistrate as a Magistrate be a member of the Church, then all Magistrates, Heathen, and Turkish are members of the Christian Church, *ex officio*, by vertue of their office.

Arg. 7.

Christ Mediator, not a temporary King.

Arg. 7. That opinion is not to be holden which layeth ground, that Christ Mediator is a temporary King, hath under him Magistrates, even heathenish, who have nothing to do with a Mediator to bear a temporall sword: for a supernaturall and spirituall end as Christs under heires, he himselfe being the first heir of all such, and so maketh heathens within the verge of the mediatory Kingdom; as if Christ were as Mediator, a King to Heathen, and all and every one of mankind, who must have Magistrates, and so maketh the Kingdome of men as men, and the Kingdom of Grace commensurable, and of alike latitude and extension, and maketh nature and grace of equall comprehension: But such is the former opinion, the proposition cannot be denied, except by Arminians, Socinians, Papists, who do maintain an universall redemption, a grace universall, a Catholick Kingdom of Grace comprehensive of all and every man, of *Pharoah, Evil-merodach, Belshazer*, all the Kings of *Romans, Persians, Assyrians, Chaldeans*, and of *Turk, India*, and such as worship the Sunne and Moon, the Devil, and the work of mens hands: The assumption is granted by Master *Coleman* who saith, *Christ is the rightfull King of the whole earth*, he meaneth Christ as Mediator, to whom the Father hath given a Kingdom.

Obj. *Doth not Christ as King make all his enemies his footstool, and subdue all things to himselfe?* Ergo, *his Kingdome is as large as all things.*

Ans. The Lord Iesus Christs power Kingly, and his power mediatory, which includeth a power as God (for he is Mediator and a mediatory King, according to both natures) doth no way make him King of Devils, of Hell, of sin, of the reprobate, and damned, no more then *Davids* power over *Ammonites*, and *Moabites*, makes him King and feeder of the *Ammonites* and *Moabites*: Never Divine said, that Christ was King of Devils, and King of Hell; though he subdue Devils and Hell, and make them his footstool, *Col.*2.15. But as hability and gifts was not sufficient to make Christ a Priest, but he behooved to have ἐξουσία authority and a lawfull calling, *Heb.*5.4,5. so he behooved to be called, set, and established on the Holy-hill of *Zion*, as a King of the Fathers making, *Psal.*2.5,6. *Psal.* 89.26,27,28,29. *Luk.* 1.32,33. *ver.* 68,69.54,55. And therefore though as King and an eternall King, he subdue all things, even his enemies;

enemies; yet it followeth not, he is King and Mediator, and Head of his enemies.

Arg. 8. All those whom Christ maketh officers, Legats and Ambassadors of his mediatory Kingdom, they have either the word of the Kingdom committed to them, as Pastors and Doctors, and of old, Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, that they may make work on the consciences of men to make them Kings and Priests unto God, or they are by the word of admonition and rebuke, to deal for the same end, as governours and Elders, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. for the officers of the Kingdome, and sword or scepter of the Kingdome, the Word of God, *Psal.* 45. 4. *Rev.* 19. 15. *Heb.* 4. 11. *Rev.* 1. 16. which are the means, are congruously proportioned, to the end, the gathering of the Saints, the perfecting of his body, *Eph.* 2. 11, 12. But never did Christ appoint the Magistrate with his sword, and his temporary rewards, and praise of well doing, to have any action on the conscience of men, or to co-operate for so high an end directly and kindly; for sure the sword cannot reach that end, except indirectly and by accident, in some imperated acts: He may procure that there be such means as word and seals, and Church-officers, and so be an intrinsecall mean to set up those which are the spirituall and truly intrinsecall means, and this is all.

So the *Belgick Arminians, apol.* fol. 302. *Grotius in pictat ordi. Hol. p.* 113. *Vtenb. p.* 28.

Object. 1. *Was not this the first step of papal tyranny, that the Church-men would be exempted from the power of the Magistrate, and set themselves up as supream, collaterall, independent powers in all Ecclesiasticall affairs, as the Magistrate was supream in all politick busines?*

Ans. It is a calumnious consequence, Pastors and Teachers will not be judged by the Magistrate in things meerly Ecclesiasticall, to stand to his Ecclesiasticall decision, as if his lips, *ex officio*, should preserve knowledge; *Ergo*, Pastors and Doctors do exempt themselves from the Lawfull power of the Magistrate in his civill judging by the sword; it is as if they would say, Church-men refuse to submit to an usurped and unlawfull power of the Magistrate; *Ergo*, they refuse to submit to their lawfull power. 2. They bring not one word to prove, that this was the first step of papal tyranny; now a supremacy and independency in doctrinals and civill things, the adversaries deny not. If King *Ahab* finde the Priests of Iehovah turn Priests of *Baal*, and the Prophets propheſie lies, we and

the

the adversaries agree that King *Ahab* hath a supream independent power, to judge and punish them with the sword, and if King *Ahab* will take on him to burne incense to the Lord, the Priests and Prophets of the Lord have an immediate supream independent power, to rebuke King *Ahab* for usurping that which is independently and incommunicably proper to the Priests onely, and they may refuse to bee judged by King *Ahab*, when he would judge them for giving out this sentence, *It belongeth not to King* Ahab, *or* King Vzziah *to burne incense to the Lord, but to the Priests, the sons of Aaron*, 2 Chron. 26. Will they say this supremacy of the Priests is a step to papall Tyranny? 3. This is rather papall Tyranny it selfe that the Magistrate as head of the Church, and as an Ecclesiasticall person may as a Magistrate governe, in all externalls, the Church, as he pleaseth, with a royall, supream, independent power; and because the Magistrate may send others to rule for him, 2 *Chron.* 19. 8, 9. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. *Ergo*, he may commit this royall power to a creature called a Prelate as to his Deputie, in his name to judge; as *Phocas* gave first a supremacy to *Boniface* the third, which no Bishop of *Rome* had before; and judge if this be not the first step to Papall Tyranny? They possibly may say, *The Magistrate can commit no Magistraticall power to any Churchman, for Christ forbad them to take on them the civill domination of the Lords of Gentiles*, Luke 22. 26, 27.

Ans. But this is an Ecclesiastick, not a civill administration; and if it be a lawfull Ecclesiasticall supremacy, why may not the Magistrate who hath power to send Deputies to act in his name, depute a lawfull Ecclesiasticall power, to Ecclesiasticall persons, Pastors and Doctors, who in the mind of the adversaries are all but the Deputies of the Magistrate in all that they doe.

Obj. 2. *But is it not Popery that the Magistrate shall be obliged as a Lictor to execute the decrees of the Church?*

The Magistrate not the servant of the Church.

Ans. I know not, if the Lictor with blind obedience be to behead *Iohn Baptist*, or if *Doeg* should kill the Lords Priests, because King *Saul* commandeth him. 2. This Argument concludeth that neither Magistrate nor people should beleeve Articles of faith, because the Church and Pastors saith so, but because *Iehovah* saith so, nor is the Ruler to beleeve or execute what the Church decrees, because they decree it, but because he beleeveth it is the will of Christ,

what

what they give out in Name of Christ. 3. Is it not Popery that the Pastors and Teachers should execute the lawes of the Magistrate both in dispensing Word, Sacraments, and Discipline? for they may not as Pastors and Doctors judge whether the Ecclesiasticall decrees of the Magistrate be the will and minde of Jesus Christ or no. The Magistrate in doctrine and discipline is the onely supream judge here, as in all causes civill, as he exerciseth a κοσμοκρατία and a dominion in the on *Luke* 22. 27. so also in the other, except the Adversaries shew us a difference. Yea as Mr. *Pryn* with the *Erastians* say, Because there is no certain form of the government of the Church in Scripture, he hath an Arbitrary power as Magistrate to appoint any government in the Church not contrary to the Word, any Officers, Prelates, and Cardinals, any ceremonies as pleaseth him, and may impose them on the consciences of Pastors and people, which is the highest Papall Tyranny on earth.

Obj. 3. *If the Magistrate be therefore subject to the Church not as a Magistrate, but as he scandalously transgresseth the Law of God, so that the Church may not rebuke and censure him, as either a Magistrate, or as a Magistrate doing his duty, but onely as a Transgressor: Then neither* 1. *one particular Pastor as a Pastor is subject to the Church, yea no man in a lawfull calling or relation as such is subject to the Church, for the Church cannot rebuke or censure a Husband as a Husband, a father as a father, a Painter as a Painter, no more then the Church can censure a Magistrate as a Magistrate; for then should the Church censure and condemn all these relations and callings, as husband, father, painter, Magistrate as intrinsecally unlawfull. Nor can the Church censure and rebuke husband, father, painter, musitian, &c. when they do right, and doe but fulfill their relations and callings, in doing the duties of husband, father, painter, no more then the Church can censure and rebuke the Magistrate when he doth his dutie.*

Ans. 1. This is not the totall, compleat, and adequate cause, why the Magistrate in spirituall things is subject to the Church, but the halfe of the cause onely; you must take in the other consideration, he is *in spiritualibus*, subject to the Church, not only as he doth sin; but 1. As he may sin scandalously. 2. As he may be directed, informed, and swayed with precepts, promises, counsels, threat-

The adequate and compleat cause why the Magistrate is subject to the Church

threatnings toward a supernaturall end to eternall life; take in all these three, and we grant all. The Magistrate and all in other relations and professions and callings are equally in spirituall things subject to the Church, as the Ministers of Christ, and in all other relations and callings, as *fathers, husbands, painters, musitians*, are in civill things equally subject to the Magistrate, according to the three former cases in a civill consideration.

Obj. 4. *But then you must prove solidly from the Word, that the Magistrate is subject to the Church in spirituall things?*

Ans. It is enough if I prove that the Magistrate is subject to the Church, to Pastors and Doctors in things belonging to his soule, and as a man and a Christian in civill things are subject to him, which to me is clear in the Word of God, as 1. Because *Timothy* and all watchmen in their person are commanded to *rebuke them that sin before all, and that in the sight of God, and the Lord Iesus, and the elect Angels, without preferring one before another, or doing any thing by partialitie*, 1 Tim. 5. 20, 21. 2 Tim. 4. 2. *And if Levi must not know his father or his mother, in the Lords cause*, Deut. 33. 9. and *Ieremiah* in rebuking not be dismayed of Kings, Princes, and Prophets, *Ier.* 1. 17. neither must Ministers accept the persons of judges, Christ rebuked his mother to whom otherwise he was subject, *Joh.* 2. 4. *Luke* 2. 51. 2. There is the practise of the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, that they have rebuked Kings, Rulers, Magistrates, Priests, Prophets, every page almost of the Old and New Testament saith this. 3. God hath no whit exempted the Rulers from rebukes, as they be men, they can and do sin. 4. Princes are the sheep of Christ, and redeemed as a part of the flock for the which Christ gave the blood of God; *Ergo*, they are to be fed and watched over, lest they also as grievous wolves prey upon the flock, *Acts* 20. 28, 29, 30. then there must be some over them, *and those who should speake the Word of the Lord to them*, and so the word of rebuke, and who should *watch for the souls of Magistrates, as those who must give an account*, whom the Magistrates must obey as others in the same condition who have souls, *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3. 1 *Thes.* 5. 12, 13, 14. 5. All the censures of the Church are for the good of soules, that the *Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord*, 2 *Thes.* 3. 14, 15. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5, 6. and for *edification*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. *Iude* v. 23. *Ergo*, the souls of Magi-

That the Magistrate is subject to the rebukes and censures of the Church proved from the Word.

Magistrates should not be defrauded of this mean of edification. 6. *Pastors as Ministers, Stewards, Ambassadors, Watchmen,* are intrusted with the word of reconciliation, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. and 1 *Cor.* 3. 5. and 4. 15. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. 2 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Ergo,* they must divide the Word aright to all within the family, 2 *Tim.* 2. 15. and rebukes and censures are a part of the word of reconciliation, no lesse then promises, and they are to prophecy death and life, as God in his word commandeth, *Ezek.* 3. 17, 18, 19, 20. and 13. 19. and 33. 7, 8, 9. 10.

7. The power of the Lord Jesus in censuring, is extended to men as ill doers, not as Magistrates, or not Magistrates, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. *Gal.* 5. 10. the power of binding and loosing is extended to a trespassing brother, who *will not hear the Church, Mat.* 18. 15, 16. and 16. 19, 20. The Magistrate is a brother, *Deut.* 17. 15. *one of the Israel of God,* as *Saul* was of of the Tribe of *Benjamin, David* of *Iudah.*

8. The Church may judge such as are within the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. but such is the Christian Magistrate.

9. Correction is a priviledge of sons and Members of the family, *Heb.* 12. 6, 7. *Rev.* 3. 19. *Ergo,* the Magistrate should not be deprived of that wherein all Christians share, *Gal.* 2. 28.

10. Discipline is a part of Christs Kingly government, if the *government be on Christs shoulders* as King, as it is *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Ephes.* 4. 11, 12. *Esa.* 22. 22. and if the Gospel be the Word and Scepter of his Kingdome, *Mark.* 1. 14, 15. and 4. 11. *Matth.* 21. 43. *Luke* 4. 43. and 8. 1. *Acts* 1. 3. and 8. 12. and 20. 25. and 28. 31. *Psal.* 45. 3. *Rev.* 1. 16. Then if Magistrates be the subjects of *Christ* as King of the *Church,* they must be subject to those who preach the Kingdome, carry the Scepter, and rule under *Christ* as King.

11. Upon the same ground, if they decree grievous decrees, *Isa.* 10. 1. *Micah* 3. 1. and be *wolves ravening the prey, Ezek.* 22. 27. let them have either *Royall or Parliamentary power,* they are to be rebuked, debarred from the holy things of God, excommunicated, and their sins bound in earth, as in heaven, *Mat.* 18, 18. *Mat.* 16. 19. Nor should *Courts* or *Parliaments* or Thrones, be cities of refuge to unjust and scandalous men.

12. Upon the same grounds Magistrates are not to be deprived

of the good of private rebukes, and admonitions, except we hate the Magistrate in our heart, and strive not to gain his soul, *Levit.* 19.17. *Mat.* 18.15,16. *Luk.* 17.3,4. *Psal.* 141.5.

Erast. l. 5. c. 1 p 299, 300. *Erast. l. 6. c. 2. p 349.* *Sanè ut Idololatram et Apostatam negamus membrum esse Ecclesiæ Christi sic etiam neq; tiem suam defendentem negamus inter membra Ecclesiæ censendum esse et quem admodum illos ex Christiano cætu juaicamus exterminandos, sic hoc putamus in eo cætu non esse ferendos. Arminiani in apolog.*

13. *Erastus* himself granteth, that Magistrates may be rebuked; and when he granteth that Apostates and Idolaters are not members of the Church, and that they are to be cast out of the Church, as he doth also; he must either grant that Christian Magistrates cannot turn Apostates and Idolaters, which is against Scripture and experience, or that if they turn Apostates and Idolaters, they remain no longer members of the Church, but are to be excommunicated; or then Christ must have made some speciall exception, that Kings though Idolaters and Apostates, do yet remain members of the Church, and are not to be cast out of the Church, which (beside that *Erastus* cannot shew) is contradictory to his words: Hence it is clear, the Magistrate if he turn as *Saul* did, a wicked man, he is to be excommunicated: But 1. By whom? by the Church? *Erastus* will deny he can be judged by the Church, because he is above the Church: by himselfe? that is against reason: By other Magistrates? he is the only supream in that Church, and by what reason he is above the Church, he is above the other Magistrates, and other Magistrates are guilty of the same fault.

Obj. 5. *The supream and principall power (called Architectonica of governing the Church in externals, either agree to the Magistrate, or to the Church; not to the Magistrate (as they say) if to the Church: Then* 1. *The universall care and inspection over the Church is taken from the Magistrate, and given to the Church;* Ergo, 2. *Then the Christian Magistrate not indirectly only, but directly must be obliged to follow the judgement of the Church, in ordaining, depriving, punishing of Ministers, or of any excommunicated.* 3. *The subjects must be obliged not to obey, yea, to disobey the Magistrate, if he decern any thing contrary to the Church; and the Magistrate as a lictor and servant must execute all.*

The supream and principall power of Church affairs not in either Magistrate or Church.

Ans. 1. There is no reason to say, that the supream and principall power by way of royall dominion (as the argument supposeth) in Church matters, should agree to either Magistrate on earth, or Church; it is a Rose of the Crown of him who is the only King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and so the Major is false: Nor is that care and inspection which is due to the Magistrate, taken from him when

when we ascribe to Christ what is his due. 2. Neither doth it follow, that the Magistrate is directly obliged to follow the judgement of the Church, except we did make the judgement of the Church supream and absolute, and armed with such a dominion as the adversaries give to the Magistrate; in which case it followeth, that the Church is directly and absolutely obliged to follow the judgement of the Magistrate, according to the way of the adversaries; and that if this argument be good, they must ascribe blind obedience, either to the Church or Magistrate, not to the Magistrate they say; *Ergo*, to the Church: Nor can they take it off by saying that the Magistrates dominon is limited by the Word of God; for they know that we teach, that all the constitutions and decrees of Synods made by the Church as the Church, is limited by the Word of God; yet they cease not to object to us, that we make the Magistrate a servant, and a lictor to the Church, and obliged by his place to give blind obedience to the Church, and therefore they are obliged to answer the argument, and remove papal dominion from their way, according to their owne argument, if they will be willing to take in to themselves, with the same measure, that they give out to others: But if they give a ministeriall power of judging to the Church, (the argument is easily answered) which they cannot give to the Magistrate, except they make his office to oblige the conscience, and his commands as magistraticall to be given out under the pain of the second death: Now his sword is too short to reach to this, I hope, except you make the vengence that he executeth on evil doers *Rom.* 13. to be eternall fire, and his sword to be no materiall nor visible sword, but such as commandeth Devils and Hell, which is absurd; for the Magistrates power of judging and commanding, is commensurable to his power of rewarding and punishing, that is, both is temporary, within time, on the body of this world: The Pastors have a power of commanding, though only ministeriall, but free of all domination, or externall coaction, which is spirituall, and the punishment is accordingly spirituall, a binding in earth and heaven; I borrow only the word of punishment, it being no such thing properly.

Obj. 6. *If the end of the Church be a spirituall, and of the Magistrate be a temporall good; and if the Magistrate have no spirituall power to attain to his temporall end, no more then the Church hath*

any

any temporall power to attain to her spirituall end; is not this a contradiction, that the Magistrate should determine what the true Church and Ordinances are, and then set them up with the power of the sword? for the Magistrates power to judge and punish in spirituall causes, must be either spirituall or civill, or then he hath none, and so acts without commission: Now for civill power, the Magistrate hath it only over the bodies and goods of men, and hath it not over the soul, nor can he have it (say I) in soul cases: It is confessed that the Magistrate hath no spirituall power to attain a temporall end, and therefore those who provoke the Magistrate, without either civill or spirituall power to punish, or prosecute, in spirituall causes, are to fear that they come too near to those frogs that proceed out of the mouth of the Dragon and Beast, and false Prophet, who with the same argument stirre up the Kings of the earth to make War against the Lambe and his followers, Rev.17. Bloody Tenent.

Blood Ten. c.84.p.122, 123.

Answ. 1. All this argument is builded on a great mistake, and a consequence never proved, except by this one word of the Author. (Therefore say I) and it is this: *The Magistrate hath no civill power over the soul, therefore* (say I) *he hath no power in soul matters, and cannot judge and punish in spirituall causes.* Sir, this is a *non sequitur*, The learned Divine *Rivetus* saith well, *The Magistrates power in spirituall things to judge and punish, is* formaliter, *and in it self and intrinsecally civill, but objective in regard of the object and extrinsecally, it is spirituall.* 1. I ask when the Author and his take a professor into Church-communion, they judge whether he be just, mercifull, and peaceable, when they excommunicate any member, for murther, for unjustice in taking away the goods of his brother? whether the Church doth judge and punish in the causes of justice, mercy and peace, which properly belongeth to the civill Magistrate, not to the Church properly; but only *ratione scandali* as they are offensive in the Church of God: I ask (I say) if the Churches power in judging and punishing be civill, or spirituall; not civill, for this Author will say, that the Church hath no power over the lives and goods of men, those belong to the Magistrate, and to his civill power: Yet he cannot deny, but the Churches power in judging and punishing here, is formally spirituall, and objectively and unproperly civill; so say I the Mgaistrates power in spirituall causes, is formally civill and objectively only spirituall,

And.Riv. in decal.in Mand.5. pag.206.

Though the Magistrate punish Ecclesiasticall scandals, yet his power to judge and punish is not Ecclesiasticall and spirituall, as the Church rebuketh and censureth civil breaches of the second table, and yet their power is not civill.

and

and he neither hath, nor needeth any ſpirituall power formally to attain his temporall end, nor needeth the Church any power formally civill to attain her ſpirituall end: The reaſon is, becauſe powers have their ſpecification and nature from their formall object, not from the materiall; becauſe the Magiſtrate puniſheth hereſies and falſe Doctrine as they diſturbe the Peace of the civill State; therefore his power is civill, and becauſe the Church cenſureth unjuſtice, inceſt, 1 *Cor.* 5, 1, 2. and ſins againſt the ſecond Table, becauſe they are ſcandalous in the Church, and maketh the name of God to be ill ſpoken of, though materially thoſe ſins be puniſhable by the Magiſtrate, yet is the Churches power ſpirituall, becauſe it judgeth thoſe as ſcandalous and offenſive to God; and therefore the power is ſpirituall, becauſe the object, to wit, as ſcandalous to the Church, and as offenſive to God is ſpirituall, even as deſtructive to civill Peace, is formally a civill object. 2. The Magiſtrate without any ſpirituall power judges what is the true Church and true ordinances, ſetteth them up by his ſword; he doth ſet them up only for a civill end, becauſe they conduce moſt for the peace and flouriſhing condition of the civill ſtate, whereof he is head, not that the members of his ſtate may attain life eternall; for the Magiſtrate intendeth life eternall to his ſubjects in ſetting up a true Church, and true Ordinances, not as a Magiſtrate, but as a godly man: (As the woman of *Samaria* brought out the *Samaritanes*, that they might receive Chriſt in their heart by faith, as ſhe had done:) But as a Magiſtrate he intendeth not life eternall to his ſubjects; ſo a Maſter as a Maſter, hireth a man to ſerve who is a believer, and as a Maſter he judgeth ſuch a one will be moſt faithfull, and active in his ſervice; now the Maſter judgeth him not to be a Saint, that he may be a fit member of the Church: The Church only as the Church is to judge ſo of this ſervant, nor doth he judge him a believer, that he may obtain life eternall, nor doth he love and chuſe him as his ſervant, that he may obtain life eternall; Chriſtians as Chriſtians, judge and love one another that way: So the Husband as a Husband doth chuſe a believing woman for his Wife, judging ſhe will perform the duties of a Wife, better then an unbelieving Wife, he judgeth her to be a believer as a Husband, and loveth her with a Husband-love as a Husband; but if he love her becauſe the image of God is in her, and as an heir of life eternall,

nall, then he loveth her as a Christian man, not as a Husband, and it is a Christian love he hath to her, such as he hath to other godly women that are also co-heirs with himself of life eternall; and this is a lawfull and a Christian love: But if this Husband should bear a Husband-love, such as he doth to his own Wife, to all other godly Wives, it should be an adulterous and unlawfull love: So the Magistrate as a Magistrate, judges, loves, chuses, and setteth up true Ordinances, a true Church, as means of a flourishing Kingdom, and of externall Peace, and pulleth down the contrary as means destructive to the peace and safety of his subjects: But he judgeth not in a spirituall manner, and with any spirituall power of the sword, of those as fitting and conducing to life eternall, and inward peace of conscience with God; but as a justified and believing Saint, he judgeth, chuseth, and loveth Ordinances, and the true Church in this consideration, and no wise as a Magistrate: If those Relations of Magistrate and Christian had been considered by the Author, he had not compared the Magistrate punishing idolatry to the Dragon, and the godly Pastors who exhort the Magistrate to punish false teachers to the Beast, and the false Propher, who maketh war with the Lambe: For the godly magistrate who advanceth the throne of the Lambe, is praise worthy; he doth cut off all wicked doers from the city of the Lord, *Psal.* 101.8. and doth this as a Magistrate, that his Kingdome might have peace and well grounded prosperity; but as a man according to Gods heart he doth it formally set on high the throne of the Lambe, nor would he have compared those worthy and dear brethren of New *England* the Saints of the most high, especially reverend Master *Cotton* to the frogs that proceeded out of the mouth of the false Prophet, *Rev.* 17. 3. Nor do the Papists use this argument at all, but another argument, and for a contrary conclusion; for the Pope as the Pope is an earthly Monarch, and as Pope hath power to translate Crowns and Kingdoms, and as Pope the Holy Ghost in him commandeth the Kings of the Earth, to make war with the Lambe and his followers, as Papists teach; do we ascribe any such power be the Church or Churchmen? are Malignants, Prelates, and Papists, the followers of the Lambe?

Obj. 7. *If the people may erect what government they will, and seems most fit for their civill condition; then governments by them so erected*

erected have no more power, nor for no longer time then the civill power or people consenting and agreeing shall betrust them with; for people are not deprived of their naturall freedom by the power of tyrants: And if so, that Magistrates receive their power of governing the Church from the people; Then a people as a people naturally considered (of what Nature or Nation soever in Europe, Asia, Africa, America) *have fundamentally and originally as men, a power to govern the Church, to see her do her duty, to correct her, to redresse, to reform, to establish, &c. And this is to subject God, Christ, heaven, the spirit, to naturall, sinfull, and unconstant men:* Indian *and* American *governments are as true and lawfull governments as in the world; and therefore their governours are keepers of the Church and of both Tables (if any Church should arise or be amongst them) and therefore (if Christ have betrusted the civill power with his Church) they must judge according to their* Indian *and* American *consciences, for others they have not.*

Ans. 1. No doubt the power that makes Magistrates, because of vertue and dexterity to govern, may unmake them when they turn tyrants, and abuse their power; and upon the same ground, as men create Magistrates, so Christian men as Christian men, act to chuse Christian and gracious Magistrates: as if a Husband as a man chuse a Wife (as grace perfumeth and spiritualizeth all the common actions of men) so Christian men are to chuse Christian Wives, Christian Masters, Christian servants; so is a Church to chuse a Christian, not an *American* Magistrate, *Deu.*17. they are not to chuse a stranger, but one from amongst their brethren, and men fearing God, and hating coveteousnes, *Exo.*18.21. *Deu.*17.15,16, 17,18,19,20. *and* 1.16. and that a Christian Magistrate receive power to govern in the Church (I deny him to be a Governour of the Church) from Christian people, I see no inconvenience: Suppose that a Christian woman chuse a Pagan Husband, she sins in her choise; and as a sinful woman chuseth a Pagan who hath no other then a Pagan conscience, to be the guide of her youth, and her head, and to love her, as Christ loved his Church, and to rule her according to his marital and Husband-power in some acts of her Christian conversation: Yea, when Christians did fight under Heathen Emperours, they gave power as all souldiers do to their Commanders, to those Heathen Captains, to command Christians according

Blood Tenent. c.93. pag.137, 138.

People as people may give power to a Magistrate to adde his auxiliary power to defend the Church, judge and punish offenders in the Church

according to their Pagan consciences, for other consciences it cannot be supposed Heathen have as this Author speaketh; nor do I see such an inconvenience, that men as men chuse a Magistrate who is a Heathen, to see not the Church as the Church; but men of the Church do their duty, and to punish them civilly when they omit Church duties, when providence compelleth *Judah*: Yea, when God commandeth *Judah* to submit to a Babylonish or Persian King, who according to his Babylonish conscience is to command them to keep the oath of God, to abstain from murther, yea, to build again the house of God, and is to punish the men of *Judah*, if they do the contrary: Here evidently the Church is to chuse Heathen Kings, who according to their Heathen consciences, are to judge and punish sins against both Tables; but they chuse them to adde there auxiliary power to help and defend the Church, not any privative or absolute power to set up what ordinances they will: Nor is it supposed that men as men may give to *Indian* and *American* Magistrates, power to judge, by rule of *Indian* consciences; what is blasphemy against Iesus Christ, what is apostacy from the Christian faith, to Iudaisme, and to punish it: For in that fare, the *Indian* Magistrate is uncapable of Magistracy in those acts, though essentially he be a lawfull Magistrate in other acts; just as Christian men and Saints by calling may make a Christian *Corinthian* amongst themselves, their Magistrate; and yet he cannot judge whether *Titius* the Physitian in *Corinth* hath poysoned *Sempronius*, as he hath a Christian conscience, but not a medicinall conscience (to speak so) or the skill and art of a Physitian to know what is poyson, what not; yet did men as men create this Christian Magistrate, to judge & punish murthers, and poysoning of Christians. 2. Let us also turn the Tables: the Author cannot deny, but Ten thousand *Christians* and *Indians*, half of each side, may come to be one civil incorporation; they create with common consent a Christian Magistrate over themselves, this they do as a society of men. The *Indians* worship their God in that society, by offering their children to the Devil, and this is their *Indian* conscience; for it is not to be supposed that an *Indian* can worship his God with other then an *Indian* conscience: By this Authors way, *Indians* and *Christians* gave to this Christian Magistrate, to judge of this *Indian* and bloody worship, with a Christian conscience, for it is supposed he can judge with no other conscience:

science:I demand whether or not this Magistrate be obliged to punish such horrid shedding of innocent blood? If he be,he is set over this incorporation to bear the sword of the Lord, and with a Christian conscience to judge and punish *Indian* consciences: Is not this as great an inconvenience as what he objecteth to us? Besides that,according to this way,he must not punish the killing of the children to the Devil; why? this is against the will of the meek Saviour in whom the Christian Magistrate believes, to persecute an *Indian* for his conscience, as this Author thinketh: Now it is no lesse an *Indian* conscience worship, and no murther to offer an innocent child to the *Indian* God, then it was to the Jews to offer an innocent Bullock or a Ram to *Jehovah.*

Obj. *But God hath forbidden in the Law of nature to kill infants to God upon any pretence.*

Ans. In the Law of nature God hath forbidden all false worship. 2. The Law of nature hath forbidden to offer any blood to God, that is, the Law of nature will never warrant us to offer in a whole brunt offering an innocent Beast to God,created for the use of man, and it should be against the Law of nature, to kill Beasts for any religious use, or for any use, except to be food or medicine for man: Except God in a positive Law, had commanded whole burnt offerings, and offering of Beasts to God: so the Law of nature forbids *Indians* to kill infants; but they tell you, there is a positive Law of their God, and in conscience they are obliged to kill their children to this God, and you must convince their conscience, that this is murther, not right worship, by reason and light of truth, not with a club and force of sword, which hath no influence upon the conscience.

3. It followeth not, that God hath subjected God, Christ, Heaven,the Spirit to naturall men; for an *Indian* Magistrate remaining an *Indian,* never received power from mem as men, nor from God, to judge of Christian worship: yea, *Indian* Magistrates as *Indians* are uncapable of judging or punishing what is against Christ, Heaven, the Spirit, and yet they are Lawfull Magistrates; for their ignorance of Christ excludeth them from having any such formal power; what Magistraticall power they have which they cannot put forth in acts, is not to a purpose for this power, which they cannot exercise, *shall never subject Christ, Heaven, the Spirit to the*

consciences of naturall men,or Indian *Magistrates* : this consequence therefore should have been proved, not presumed as a truth. 4. He saith, *If any Church should arise amongst those who have* Indian *Magistrates, Christ should betrust the* Indian *civill power with his Church.* I answer, This is non-consequence also, for the state of heathenship in the *Indian*, should exclude him from any such trust; if a Church arise they are to be under the *Indian* Magistrate, while God in his providence free them from under him, that they may chuse a Christian Magistrate, who may be a nurse-father to them? 5. The Lord betrusteth his Church to the civil power as an auxiliary power, not to exercise any magistraticall power over the Church, and over their conscience; but only for the Churches good, and for their conscience.

A governor of, or over the Church, a governor in the Church, a governor for the Church, are differenr.

These would be distinguished, a governour of, or over the Church. 2. A Governour in the Church. 3. A Governour for the Church; neither Christian nor Heathen Magistrate is a Governor of the Church, or over the Church: An Heathen Magistrate may be a Governour in the Church, giving to the Church in his dominion leave to live under him, as *Nebuchadnezzar* did to the Church in captivity. The Christian Magistrate is a Governour for the Church; 1. Men are governed as men politically by Magistrates though Heathen. 2. Men are governed as Christians and Citizens of Heaven, and Members of Christs invisible body, by the inward government of the Spirit and Word. 3. Men are governed as Members of Christs visible Body in Church-society Ecclesiastically, by Church-officers called ἡγούμενοι, *Heb.*13.7.13. *Who watcheth for our Souls, and are over us in the Lord, and must give an account to God,* whom we are to obey in a Church-society: so *Pilate* is called, *Mat.* 27. 2. it is given to Kings and Rulers, 1 *Pet.*2.14. εἴτε ἡγεμόσι, *Act.* 23. 24. so it is opposed to διακονῶν to one that serveth, *Luk.* 22. 26. no question it is a word borrowed from the seventy interpreters who use it, *Iosh.*13.21. *Mich.*3.9. *Ezech.*44.3. *Dan.*3.2. the words προϊστῶτες, 1 *Tim.*5.17. προϊσάμενοι, *Rom.*12.8. 1 *Thes.*5.12. are ascribed to Church-officers: Yea, the word ἀρχων a Ruler or a Commander, *Act.*23.5. is ascribed to the High-Priest, who was but a Church-officer, and the stile given to Rulers, *Exod.*22.28. from which these words are taken, is Gods: so *Ioh.* 10.35,36. compared with *Psal.* 82. 1. *Exod.*21.6. and proveth the same

אלהים לא תקלל
Pagn. dijs non maledices.

same, though Church-officers be onely Ministers, not Lords, not Princes, having any dominion over the Lords inheritance.

Obj. 8. *But is not this an easie way to extricate our selves out of all doubts, if we say in Church-government, that the doctrinal and declarative part is in the Ministers of Christ, as* Mat. 28. *Go teach, &c. and the punitive and censuring part in the Christian Magistrate,* Rom. 13. *according to that for the punishing of evill-doers, as* Mr. Coleman *saith.* Mr. *Colemans* re-examination. p. 15.

Ans. This *Erastian* way will intricate us not a little, and is destructive of the Covenant of both Kingdoms. 1. Its a distinction void of Scripture and reason, for the Apostolick Churches by it must have no Government as Churches at all: for to publish the Gospel which is made the one half; Yea, all Church-government (for this punitive part is a dream) is not Church-government, nor any part thereof. The distinction of an doctrinal or declarative, and of a punitive part of Church-government, of which the former is given to Pastors, the latter to the Magistrate, a heedlesse and senseless notion.

1. Master *Coleman* desires that the Parliament would give to preachers Doctrine and power of preaching and wages, learning and competency: as for Governing of the Church, let the Magistrate have that, Ministers have other work to do, and such as will take up the whole man. Sermon, *Pag.* 24,25. Then preaching the Word to the Church, cannot be any part of Governing of the Church.

2. Because Church-government is properly acted by the Church, with the power of the keyes, to bind and loose in earth, as in Heaven by Church-censures, and pardoning of an offender, and committed to many, to the Church, to a society gathered together, *Mat.* 18.18. 1 *Cor.* 5.1, 2, 3, 4, 5. But publishing of the Gospel is done by one single Pastor, even to the end of the world, even where there is no Church, even in the hearts of the Atheniens, *Act.* 17. 33,34. of *Felix*, *Act.* 24.25. of the Iayler not Baptised, *Act.* 16.29,30,31. of the *Woman of Samaria*, Ioh. 4.28,29,30. The Gospel exerciseth a doctrinall and externall government on thousands, the like without the Church visible: yea, and who never are members of a visible Church; is this any Church-government of which we now speak? and in all the Scripture a power of the keyes to govern the visible Church, was never committed to any one single man by Iesus Christ; if an Apostolick-priviledge of *Pauls* excommunicating, his alone be objected, I can easily answer,

Apostles

Apostles continue not to the end of the world. 2. This doctrinal publishing of the word, is the plants and flowers of the Garden; but Church-government is the hedge, and those two are not to be confounded. 3. *Paul* differenceth them as two distinct qualities of a Preacher, 1 *Tim.* 3. while he will have him apt to teach, *ver.* 2. and *v.*4,5. one that can rule the Church of God well; and 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. ruling well, is distinguished from labouring in the Word and Doctrine as a charge worthy of lesse honour, from a charge worthy of double honour. 4. All Protestant Divines distinguish Doctrine and Government, the former belonging to the being and essence of a visible Church, as an essentiall note thereof, I mean the publike and settled publishing of the Gospel; the other is only a thing belonging to the well being of the visible Church, and an accident thereof; so it is a heedlesse tenent to make the former a part with the latter. 5. When we swear a conformity of Doctrine and worship in one Confession, one Catechisme, one Directory, we do not swear the same over again, when we swear to endeavour the neerest uniformity in Church-government, *&c.* which we cannot but do, if the Doctrine and Worship be nothing but a part of Church-government; or if it be all Church-government: now if Mr. *Colemans* punitive part be but his own dream, as I hope is easily proved, there is no Church Government at all. Now how Mr. *Coleman* did swear to indeavour the neerest uniformity of a *Chimera*, and a thing that is just nothing, let himself consider.

As for Mr. *Colemans* punitive part of *Church Government* by the Magistrate, this by his way is done by the power of the sword of the Magistrate, saith he, and therefore citeth *Rom.* 13. *He beareth not the sword in vain*, &c. Hence either the Apostolique *Church* had no censures at all, and so no visible government and order, but preaching of the Word was all; and except we would adde to our pattern, and be more wise then the Holy Ghost and the Apostles, we ought to have no *Church Government*, but onely preaching the Word; or then the Apostles, Pastors, and Teachers medled with the sword of the Emperour *Nero* in discharging the punitive part, for with no other instrument doth the Magistrate punish ill-doers, but with the sword, *Rom.* 13.4,5. This text Mr. *Coleman* citeth to make bloody *Nero* a Church-governour: But no ground is for this in the Word, that *Paul*, *Peter*, *Timothy*, *Archippus* meddled with the Emperours sword, or that the weapons of their warfare were

were carnal; or that *Paul* was the Minister of God, bearing the sword for the punishment of evil doers: I think *Paul* speaketh of civil bodily punishing, *Rom.*13. and no violence greater can be offered to the Word of God; for if that power be an Ecclesiastical administration, every soul, and so the Christian Magistrate, is to be subject to this Ecclesiastical and Church power; and if so, then to the Church: If Mr. *Coleman* deny the consequence, I conceive to be subject to the Magistrate, is *Rom.*13. to be subject to the power civil, that is, of God: If the Magistracy be an Ecclesiastical ordinance and a vicegerent power of the mediator, as they say it is; then to be subject to the Magistrate, is to be subject to this Church power, and to be subject to the Church. 2. The punishing power of the Magistrate as such, doth not bind and loose on Earth, and open and shut Heaven; for then *hoc ipso*, because the Magistrate doth judge and punish evil doers, the mans sin should be bound in Heaven; now so the judging and punishing power should take hold of the conscience: But it is certain, the Magistrate as judge may take away the life of a Capital Delinquent, when he knoweth the man repenteth and believeth, and findeth mercy with God; *Ergo*, this magistratical power is not Ecclesiastical; for if the man to the knowledge of all repent, the Church hath no power to bind his sin on Earth, nor will God bind his sin in Heaven; but yet the Magistrate as a Magistrate is to punish; *Ergo*, this punishing power is no Ecclesiastical power, nor any part of Church-government.

That the Magistrates punishing with the sword, scandalous persons should be a part of Church-government, a reasonless conceit.

3. The punitive power of the Magistrate hath influence on men as ill-doers, whether they be within the Church or without the Church, and worketh on men as Members of the Common wealth, whether Christians, or Heathens, Indians, or Americans: But no punitive power of the Church, is or can be extended to those that are without the Church, but Pastors and the Church leaveth them to be judged of God, 1 *Cor.*5.12. nor can they be cast out of the visible Church, who were never within it.

4. The punitive power of the Church as such, floweth from Christ as Mediator, Head and King of the Church; because Christ as Head and Mediator, hath appointed a shepheards staffe, discipline, or rebukes, Church-censures, and Excommunication for his sheep, his redeemed ones, family, and people, for whom he is Mediator,

ator, his Scepter and Rod must be congruously and suitably proportioned to his *Crown*, and spiritual Royal power: But the punitive power of Magistrates floweth from God the *Creator*, as the whole world is the family of God; so for the preservation of humane society, the Lord hath been pleased to appoint Magistrates, and the punitive power of them by the sword, to correct ill-doers for the peace, good, and safety of humane societies.

5. All punitive Church-power is for edification, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. *That the mans spirit may be savdd in the day of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. that the party may be gained by private and publike Church rebukes, *Mat.* 18. 15. *If he hear thee, thou hast gained thy Brother*, v. 18. *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen*, &c. *Ergo*, if he hear the *Church* his soul is gained, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14, 15. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. but the intrinsecal end of punishing an evil doer, is not the gaining of his soul; but a political civil satisfaction of justice for a wrong done to humane society, that others may fear, and do so no more; the Magistrate in using his sword as a Magistrate, looketh not to this as the intrinsecall end of the sword, to convert a soul, to augment the number of the subjects of *Christs* mediatory Kingdom; nor doth he as a Magistrate proportion the measure of the stroke of the sword according to the repentance and godly sorrow of the man who hath sinned; but in justice his eye is not to pity or spare the blasphemer, though as dear to him as a father and friend, *Deut.* 13. 6, 8, 9. 10. *Deut.* 33. 9. whether he repent, or not repent; but the *Church* censure, respecting intrinsecally the gaining of the soul, is proportioned to the offenders sorrow for his sin, that he be not swallowed with over much sorrow, 2 *Cor.* 2. 7, 8, 9, 10.

There is neither co-action, nor properly so called punishment in the Church. *Trigland. dis. Theolo. de potest. civil et Eccles. Iast. c.* 13. *p.* 257.

6. This punitive part of *Church* Government, is neither in name, nor in thing: in Scripture *Triglandius* denieth that there is any Ecclesiastical, co-active, or compulsive power properly so called in the *Church*; there is no violence used by *Christ* as King of his *Church*; this shepheard carrieth the Lambs in his bosome, *Isai.* 40. 11. *Hyeronimus* said well, *The King or Magistrate ruleth over men that are unwilling, he meaneth in punishing them; but the Pastor doth it to men that are willing*: And renowned *Salmasius* citing this, addeth that of the Apostle *Peter* to the Elders, Feed the flock ἐπισκοποῦντες οὐκ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλ' ἑκουσίως; It is not *pena* a proper punish-

punishment that the Church doth inflict, nor doth the Scripture speak so, nor is the thing it self punishment, or any punitive power here; indeed all co-active power of the Magistrate as the Magistrate, and all punishment issuing from it, is against the will of the punished, and is inflicted with the dominion of the sword; we know how the Adversarie side here with Papists who make all Church censures to be pennances inflicted upon penitents against their will: Therefore saith *Salmasius*, *Of old, censures were so voluntary, that to deny them was a punishment, and they were desired and sought as a Benefit, as the ancient Canons of Councels, and Canonick Epistles, and Writings of Fathers bear Witnesse*; and this doth prove, if Iesus Christ have a willing people, *Psal.* 110. and if rebukes and censures be to the Saints as medicine that will not break the head, *Psal.* 141.5. no medicine is received unwillingly by wise men, and no medicine is a punishment; then the punitive power of the Magistrate hath no place in the Church as the Church.

Hycronymus in Epitaphio Nepotiani, Rex nolentibus præest, episcopus volentibus.

Cl. Salm. in apparatu ad libros de primati. part. 1. p. 154.155. adeo autem volentibus pœnitentia dabatur ut negata pro pœna esset, et pro beneficio peteretur atque acciperetur, a delinquentibus, ut ex multis Canonibus conciliorum constat, Epistolis Canonicis, et scriptis aliis patrum.

7. The Magistrate dispenseth no Ecclesiasticall censures as a Magistrate: For 1. He rebuketh not as a Magistrate, for rebukes as rebukes intrinsecally tend to the gaining of the soul; so as to receive rebukes willingly, is a Character of a child of God, and to hate it a signe of a wicked man, *Eccles.*7.5. *Prov.*28.23. *and* 6.23. *and* 1.23. *c.*13.18. *c.*15.5.10.31.32. *Prov.* 5.12. *and* 10.17. *and* 15.10. *and* 9. 8. *and* 13. 1. so the sword cannot inflict this censure, nor can the Magistrate cast out of the Synagogue or Church; he can banish, which is a locall casting out; but not excommunicate, if he be said to be an Ecclesiasticall person exercising punitive power in the Church, because he judgeth and punisheth sins against the Church, 1. This is nothing, except he inflict spirituall punishment of rebuking and excommunication, which he cannot do, because he hath not to do with the conscience, or the converting of a sinner. 2. If he be a Church-governour, because he punisheth sins against the Church, but in so far as they disturb the Peace of the State, then Pastors may be civil Governours, and use the sword, which Christ forbiddeth, *Luk.* 22. 26, 27. *and* 12. 13, 14. because they inflict spirituall punishment, such as publike rebukes on mur-

therers, parricides, but in a spirituall way, to gain souls to Iesus Christ; and they rebuke murthers, thefts, thought not as committed against the State and Peace of humane societies, but as offensive to God, scandalous to the Church, and destructive to the souls of those who commit such offences: All the punishment Ecclesiasticall which we plead for (though we borrow only the name, it being unproperly so called) is spiritual rebukes, debarring of wicked men from the society of the Saints, and the holy things of God, that they pollute not such pearls. *Bullinger* is alledged by *Erastus* as a favourer of this way, and some private Epistles of *Bullinger* written to *Erastus* cited, but nothing of the publike writings of *Bullinger*: It is true he saith, he is pleased with *Erastus* his *Theses*, but 1. That he was not of *Erastus* his mind wholly, is evinced from these Epistles. 1. *Bullinger* strove with the Anabaptists of his time, who contended for either a Church of regenerate persons, or none. Bullinger. *Diu cum Anabaptistis nostris contendimus hac de re, et ostendimus veram Ecclesiam posse esse, et dici Ecclesiam, quæ excommunicatione hâc careat.* 2. He saith, he himself, *D. Wolphius, Lavater, Hallerus, Zwinglius, Gualther*, never condemned the Church of *Geneva*; Ergo, they never condemned Presbyterial Government. 3. He saith it will be for the edification of the Churches of the *Palatine*, that this excommunication be. Now we know divers there ascribed to the Magistrate *plus æquo*, and said that the tythes belonged *jure divino* to the Magistrate; The truth is these Divines were too obnoxious to the lust of Christian Magistrates. *Calvin, Farel*, complain much of the Magistrates usurpation in this. 4. They thought hard to exulcerate the minds of Princes to excommunicate the Magistrate, and *longè magis abalienatos reddere, inferiores gradus conscendere, superiores vero intactos reddere*: But was it not an abuse to excommunicate the poor people, and spare the Magistrate?

That *Bullinger* is not of the mind of *Erastus*. *Bulling. Epist. privat. ad Erastum.*

Bul. Epis. ad Erast. 3. *Bullinger* would not have the question of excommunication to come in publike; why? *cum hoc tempore aliâs satis afflicta sit Ecclesia.*

4. He seems to incline that none should be debarred from the Lords Table, that acknowledgeth their sins, *cœna sit libera omnibus peccata sua agnoscentibus et veniam a Christo petentibus*; we say Amen, so they be truly penitent to the Church, and not such as

Paul

Paul speak of, 2 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. to whom confession of sins before the Church is a manifest form of godlinesse.

5. *Bullinger* and *Gualther* writ to the Prince Elector to punish scandalous persons: But with all *quanquam arbitramur illust. Principem admonitionem nostram sibi soli reservaturum, qua duntaxat dissidia manifesta in Ecclesia prævenire voluimus*: Hence this (*tecum sentimus*) of *Bullinger* written to *Erastus* was; 1. His private opinion, that he desired not to be known to the Churches; therefore *Erastus* wronged *Bullinger*, who left his secret letters to be printed. 2. Many learned men in these Churches beside Anabaptists, and the *Palatinate Catechisme* were against *Erastus*.

6. He saith *Zwinglius* was the chief man to have excommunication brought in *inductam cuperet*. *Epist. ad Erastum.*

7. He desired *Beza* not to answer *Erastus*, for *peaces cause*, and the same he wrote to *Erastus*.

A learned and holy preacher to the Prince *Elector*, wrote thus to *Bullinger*. *Queror* (*fr. m. d. dilecte*) *quod approbaris Theseis D. Erasti, contra disciplinam Ecclesiasticam scriptas, quæ non tantum impiæ sunt, sed viam sternunt ad Atheismum; hortor et obsecro ut publicè testeris te novas illas Theseis improbare. Quod nisi feceris, futurum est ut videaris dissentire non tantum a doctâ illa vetustate, sed etiam a Zwinglio, et Oecolampadio aliisque, adeoque et cum teipso pugnare.* *Petr. Dathenus.*

Bullinger in 1 Cor. 5. *Excommunicatio non est exercenda, ut Anabaptistæ volunt, a toto Ecclesiæ cœtu, sed a dilectis ad hoc hominibus.*

Excommunicatio apud veteres est exclusio a communione Sacramentorum.

Excommunicatio est supplicium temporale, disciplina externa ad medendum instituta.

Bullinger in Mat. 18. *esse Ethnicum et publicanum significat esse et haberi inter facinorosos, quibus nihil neque officij neque sinceri committas.*

Idem. Hortor ut salutare hoc pharmacum (excommunicationis) e cœtu Sanctorum pontificis avaritia eliminatum reducatur.

Idem in Mat. 18. *finis consilij domini est, (in negotio disciplinæ) ut corrigantur scelerati in Ecclesia, et auferantur scandala.*

Bullinger in 2 Thes. 3. *hic habemus abstensionem seu exclusionem, qua a tribuum societate et publicorum pascuorum usu-fructu excludimus*

dimus contumaces et omnes admonitiones contemnentes; aliter etiam locus potest interpretari. These be contradictory to *Erastus* his expositions, and way which maketh excommunication nothing, and putteth all Church-discipline on the point of the Magistrates sword. I cannot say but that saying did too little prevail with *Bullinger*, *Amicus Socrates*, *Amicus Plato*, *sed magis amica veritas*: for *Erastus* was his intimate and too dear friend, *etiam errores amicorum et nævi sunt nobis pergrati.*

Bullinger in Mat.18. *in illa. Dic Ecclesiæ. Excommunicatio est disciplina externa sanctorum in Ecclesia conversantium, quâ ex communione abiiciuntur sanctorum, aut commodè alioqui corriguntur, coercenturve qui scandalizant Ecclesiam,---hæ particulares Ecclesiæ deligunt sibi quoque veluti Senatum Collegiumve optimorum virorum qui juxta Canonem sacrum disciplinam hanc exerceant*: What is this but a Presbytery? *Ceterum qualis fuerit Ethnicorum et publicanorum reputatio facilè est colligere ex Evangelio et Paulo ad* Ephe.2. *Certe alieni sunt a gratia, nihil Communionis habentes cum sorte sanctorum.*

Bullinger, Ser. 5. *decad.* 10. pag. 384. *Sicut autem dominus privatim voluit admoneri et corripi prævaricantes Ecclesiæ Ministros, ita ejusdem admonitions et correctionis bonum extendit ad universam Ecclesiam*: Ergo, *habuit vetus Ecclesia sanctum Presbyterorum senatum, qui delinquentes in Ecclesia diligenter admonebat, corripiebat graviter, adde et consortio excludebat Ecclesiastico, si nihil emendationis expectari posse videretur,---*1 Cor. 5. *decrevi ut is qui hoc scelus patravit*, &c.

Musculus in locis Commun. de Ministris verbi, pag. 204. *disciplina Ecclesiastica includit morum correctionem, tum privatorum, tum publicorum, deinde et judicia Ecclesiastica----hisce quoque de rebus non constituet Minister suopte arbitratu, sed erit ad institutionem earum director, et adhibebit suffragia et consensum suæ plebis, ne quid invitæ Ecclesiæ imponatur; denique curabit ut plebs ipsa viros graves, timentes Dei ac boni Testiomnij deligat, quorum curâ et vigilantiâ Ecclesiæ disciplina administretur, et si quid gravioris momenti accidat ad Ecclesiam ipsam referatur.*

I grant it was the error of that worthy instrument of Reformation that he referreth all to the Christian Magistrate: and so he saith, *hæc omnia----pertinent ad illas Ecclesias tantum quæ Christia-*

num

num Magistratum non habent; non potest hic certi quicquam præscribi, sed fideles et prudentes Ministri pro conditione temporum, publici status et necessitatis Ecclesiasticæ disciplinam hanc sic attemperabunt, ut omnia fiant decenter, honestè et in ædificationem Ecclesiæ. in Mat. 18. *Habendi sunt pro hominibus prophanis et a Rep. Christianorum alienis, qui excommunicati sunt.*

He favours not a little the *Erastian* way; for he maketh *Moses* the institutor of Religion to *Aaron*, and the Ministers the servants of the Christian Magistrate, *loc. de Magistratu. Wolfangus Musculus* 16 *de Magist.* pag. 630. *penes Magistratum est locorum Ecclesiasticorum constitutio; defendere leges possunt* Inferiores, *sed constituere non possunt nisi Superiores,* pag. 631, 632.--- *Respondet ad illud dic Ecclesiæ. Ecclesiæ Dei magistratui pio ac fideli tunc distribuebantur ut ecclesiis ab apostolis plantatis usu uenit:* Yet he goeth not with *Erastus*, for he saith, *pag.* 634. *Neque docet Magistratus, neque administrat Sacramenta, sed hæc faciunt Ministri,* pag. 628. *Moses primus Catholicus Israelis Magistratus--omnem in populo Dei religionem constituit ipsique Aaraoni et Levitarum ordini facienda et vitanda præscripsit---adeo ut cura instituendæ ac moderandæ religionis pertineat ad Magistratum, administrandæ vero ad sacerdotem; porro si peccaverit formam præscribit--- quomodo procedendum sit cum impœnitentibus.*

Lucratus es fratrem; fructus est laboris tui. Dic Ecclesiæ: Tertius gradus habet provocationem ad totam ecclesiam h. e. *ad cœtum fidelium cujus vos estis membra; est autem Ecclesia hic cetus fidelium in quo verbum Christi et Sacramenta recte administrantur; hanc formulam post secuti sunt apostoli, ut est* 1 Cor. 5. 3. *et* 2 Cor. 2. 6. *sit tibi* h. e. *quo loco aperti hostes Christi et aperti peccatores habentur; sic illum habeto; nihil sit tibi cum eo negotij, separa te ab illo, satis jam cognovisti hominem, constat eum induratum et reprobum esse; hic est authoritas finalis sententiæ Ecclesiæ.*

Aretius Coment. in 1 Cor. 5. *propositio. Homines Christum professi, quoad fieri potest, flagitiosos vitare debent. Corinthiis omni studio laborandum ut incestuosum suo et Ecclesiæ bono ad tempus excludant.*

Finis excommunicationis alter vt salvus sit totus homo in die mortis, vel in novissimo judicio---alter finis respicit Ecclesiam, sic omnibus vitanda est vobis contagio.

In

In Matthew 7. *Sanctum canibus non dandum. Vult Christus ostendere doctrinam Evangelij et mysteria pietatis non esse Communicanda ingratis et contemptoribus---persecutoribus et voluptuarijs hominibus. Gualtherus in* Matthew 18. *homili.* 220. *Sit tibi velut quispiam Ethnicus et quispiam publicanus, id est, hoc judicio agnosce eum non esse civem aut membrum germanum Ecclesiæ, et quia ipse sese a societate Ecclesiæ segregat, dum hujus judicio refragatur, sit tibi Ethnici et publicani loco, cum quo nihil porro consortij habeas, sed Dei judicio illum permitte, qui tantam contumaciam inultam minimè sinet;* but he addeth, *hunc ordinem observarunt olim Christiani homines dum nullos haberent Magistratus Christianos.*

Interdum etiam Satanæ tradebant tales, quod non ex paucorum arbitrio fiebat, sed cum publico Ecclesiæ consensu, 1 Cor. 5.

The error of *Gualther* to please the usurping Magistrate.

Quod autem hoc omne ad suam excommunicationem Anabaptistæ detorquent nimium inepte et ridicule (ut alia omnia) faciunt; nam primo insolenter vendicant quod apostolis datum fuit, et Satanæ tradere volunt homines excommunicatione suâ, quâ ne culicem quidem possunt occidere; deinde etiam in cœnam invehunt sine Christi instituto et exemplo: To which I must say the Anabaptists were right, and *Gualther* in an error in this point.

Gualther. *in* 1 Cor. 5. *accusat Eccl siam propter incestum, quod incestuosum non sine publicâ totius Ecclesiæ infamiâ nimis diu tolerarint---propter unius hominis scelus totam Corinthiorum Ecclesiam, et imprimis hujus præfectos et doctores (quid hoc aliud est quam Collegium pastorum et Seniorum) tam graviter accusat; sed ita illi merebantur, quod indulgentiores fuissent hactenus erga eum, quem punire poterant, et cujus libidinem coercere jam pridem debuissent.*

Tota Ecclesia excommunicat---erant in Ecclesia tunc constituti Seniores, at horum arbitrio causam non permittit apostolus---quotquot ergo rem tanti momenti ad paucos referunt, vel etiam sibi soli vindicant excommunicandi potestatem, ij Ecclesiam jure suo spoliant, & Tyrannidem affectant piis intolerabilem.

Nec enim mihi necessarium videtur, ut Ecclesiæ Christianæ ist a ad se trahant, quæ principes habent vere Christianos, quorum authoritate, morum disciplina constitui & conservari potest, urgent quidem Excommunicationem Anabaptistæ, & quia hanc improbamus, nos Ecclesias impuras habere clamant; sunt etiam alii qui etsi principes

habeant

habeant verè Christianos, neque leges desint quibus morum licentia coercetur, ad hoc tamen senatu Ecclesiastico opus esse aiunt, qui in quorumvis mores animadvertat, et cui in principes quoque jus sit, et eos qui scandalum aliquod publicum dederunt, a cœnæ dominicæ communione arceat, et eosdem non nisi suo judicio probatos, et præstitis prius satisfactionibus publicis ad Ecclesiæ societatem et cœnæ usum rursus admittat---quasi vero non alia disciplinæ forma institui posset, quam quæ ipsis conficta est. Distinguunt illi inter jurisdictionem Ecclesiasticam et politicam quoad meram disciplinam et scelerum pœnas, at distinctio ista ex pontificorum officina deprompta est; in sacris vero scripturis nusquam habetur.

In Lucam. c. 12. *in illa (quis me constituit judicem) docet ut singuli se intra metas suas contineant neque res aggrediantur a sua vocatione alienas*: He speaketh against Anabaptists of that time who preached without a calling.

The Reader may perceive that *Bullinger*, *Gualther*, and *Musculus* 1. Do acknowledge, that the place *Mat.* 18. and 1 *Cor.* 5. do clearly prove an Ecclesiastical excommunication, which *Erastus* denieth. 2. That *Erastus* expoundeth these two places against the mind of those his friends: And never Divine in the world, Protestant, Papist, Lutheran, never Councel, Father, Doctor, Ancient, or Modern, expounded the place *Let him be to thee as a Heathen*, as *Erastus* doth. 3. These Divines difference the Magistrate and the Church, in censures, power, function. *Erastus* confoundeth them, and saith as the Anabaptists of old did; against whom, *Luther*, *Bullinger*, *Gualther*, *Lavater*, *Musculus*, *Wolfius*, *Aretius*, *Simlerus*, disputed, that the civil Magistrate may lawfully dispence the Word and Sacraments. 4. They never condemned the Discipline of *Geneva*; *Erastus* doth. 5. They acknowledge there was in the apostolick Church, an Ecclesiastical Senate or Presbytery: *Erastus* saith, this is a devise wanting Scripture. 6. They denied Excommunication to be exercised by all the Church, as a devise of the Anabaptists: *Bullinger* saith, 1 *Cor.* 5. *a dilectis ad hoc hominibus*. *Erastus* saith, it must be exercised by the whole Church, if there be any such thing. 7. *Bullinger* and *Gualther*, think that Discipline is necessary in the Church: *Erastus* refuseth any such thing.

Bullinger *Gualther* and others differ much from *Erastus*.

2. *Bullinger* and *Gualther* do think, that the Lords Supper, which is an action of publike thanksgiving and communion, should

not

Gual. in Ep. ad Theod. Bezam an causa d. inservire debeat excommunicationi, atque adeo in alium usum converti, quam qui nobis a Christo monstratus, & ab apostolis traditus est.

not be turned into a punishment, which is a Use that Christ and his Apostles hath not taught us: But this is easily answered, 1. *The pearls and holy things of the Gospel are not turned into another Use then Christ hath ordained*; because they are denied to dogs and swine as a punishment of their swinish disposition; and if these pearls were given to swine, should they not be turned to another Use then is ordained by Christ? Is not the union of members in a Church-body a sweet bound? is this communion translated to a bastard end, unknown to Christ and the Apostles? because the incestuous man is cast out of that Communion? This is as who would say, the Table of the House is a symbol of a sweet Communion of all the children of the House; *Ergo*, the Table is turned from its native Use, and is abused, if a fugitious and wicked son be turned out at the doors and removed from the Table. I think the contrary is true; the Lords Table ordained for children, is converted into an Use not known to Christ and his Apostles, when the Table is prepared for dogs and swine; and this argument is against Christ, *Mat.* 7. as much as against us. 2. By this the excommunicated cast out of the House, is not debarred from the Table of the House. What sense is here? the offender is cast out from amongst the children of the Lords family, and yet is admitted to the Table of the family?

3. These great Divines teach, that in the dayes of Christ and the Apostles, there was such an ordinance as excommunication, and that the Church who worketh not miracles, for any thing that we read, and received a precept from the Holy Ghost for Excommunication, as a moral and perpetual mean to remove scandals, to humble and shame an obstinate offender, to preserve the Church from contagion, and to edifie all, as is clear, *Mat.* 18.15,16,17,18, 19. 1 *Cor.* 5.1,2,3,4,5,6. 2 *Thes.* 3.14,15. *Rom.* 16.17. 2 *Cor.* 10.8. that the Church (I say) or men must be wiser then Christ, and remove this mean of edification, and substitute the sword of the Magistrate that hath no activity or intrinsecal influence for such a supernatural end as edification: this cannot but be a condemning of the lawgiver Christs wisdom. Whereas Mr. *Prinne* and others say, that by the preaching of the Word, not by Church-discipline, men are converted to Christ, as witnesse the many thousands of godly people in *England* where there have been no government, but

The Christian Magistrate cannot supply the place of Excommunication.

but prelatical: I answer, 1. This is to dispute against the wisdom of Christ who ascribeth to private rebukes and Church censures, the gaining of souls, the saving of the spirit, repentance, and humiliation, *Mat.*18.15,16. 1 *Cor.*5.5,6. 2 *Cor.*2.6,7,8,9. 2 *Thes.*3.14,15. *Rom.*16.17. 2 *Cor.*10.8. because preaching is more effectual; *Ergo*, is the Discipline not effectual? 2. Consider if thousands more would not have been converted if Christs Government had been set up for which Mr. *Cartwright*, Mr. *Udal*, Mr. *Dearing*, and the godliest did supplicate the Parliament. 3. Consider if there hath not been in *Scotland* as many thousands, comparing the numbers rightly, when the Church was terrible as an Army with Banners. 4. Consider how the Tigurine Churches and others, for want of the hedge, have been scandalously wicked. 5. The Magistrate by punishing drunkenness, or fornication or extortion (for he cannot take away the life for these) doth not keep the lump of the whole Church from being leavened and infected with the contagion of such: The Church by removing and casting out such an one, must do that; and the personal separating from such as walk inordinately, cannot be an act of the Magistrate, and yet cannot but be a perpetual and moral mean or ordinance that the Church is to use, not only when they have not a Christian Magistrate, but perpetually; for we are to withdraw from those that walk inordinately, and are not to be corrupted with having intire fellowship with wicked men, whether the Church have a Christian Magistrate or no: I am to gain my brother by rebuking, and by telling the Church, and to esteem one that heareth not the Church, as an Heathen, or a Publican, that I may gain him: Whether there be a Christian or an Heathen Magistrate in the Church, except it can be proved, that the Magistrate as the Magistrate, is to gain souls to God: Yea, *Musculus*, *Bullinger*, and *Gualther*, have alike reason to say, there is no need that we rebuke privately a trespassing brother, *and that we forgive him seven times a day*, when the Church hath a Christian Magistrate, as they can say there is no need of Excommunication: for if the sword can supply the room of one spiritual ordinance of God, why not of another also? and the text will bear us out as well to say, we are not to eschew the company of a scandalous brother, for shaming of him, and for the danger of being leavened by him, because the Magistrates sword

may ſupply the want of that mean of edifying, as well as it may ſupply the want of Excommunication: Yea, they may ſay there is no need of publike rebukes by the Word, the ſword may ſupply theſe alſo.

C. 18. The *Helvetian* Confeſſion is approved by the Tygurine Paſtors, by the Divines of *Berne*, *Baſil*, *Geneva*. *Deus ad colligendam vel conſtituendam ſibi Eccleſiam eamque gubernandam et conſervandam ſemper uſus eſt Miniſtris----Miniſtrorum virga, inſtitutio, functio vetuſtiſſima ipſius Dei eſt, non nova, non hominum eſt ordinatio---cumque omninò oporteat eſſe in Eccleſia, diſciplinam, et apud veteres quondam uſitata fuerit excommunicatio, fuerintque judicia Eccleſiaſtica in populo Dei, in quibus per viros prudentes et pios (ipſiſimum presbyterium) exercebatur diſciplina, Miniſtorum quoque fuerit ad ædificationem diſciplinam moderari,* &c. *Magiſtratus officium præcipuum eſt pacem et tranquillitatem publicam procurare et*

C. 30. *conſervare---Gallica Confeſſio.* the 29. *Credimus veram Eccleſiam gubernari debere eâ politiâ, ſive diſciplinâ quam* D. N. I. C. *ſancivit, ita ut,* viz. *in ea ſint paſtores, presbyteri ſive Seniores et diaconi,* &c. *Anglicana,* Art.33. *Qui per publicam Eccleſiæ denunciationem rite ab unitate Eccleſiæ præciſus et excommunicatus is ab univerſa fidelium multitudine---habendus eſt tanquam Ethnicus et publicanus.*

Art. 37. *Cum Regiæ Majeſtati Summam gubernationem tribuimus---non damus Regibus noſtris aut verbi Dei, aut Sacramentorum adminiſtrationem---ſed eam tantum prærogativam quam in ſacris ſcripturis a deo ipſo, omnibus piis principibus ſemper fuiſſe attributam, hoc eſt ut omnes ſtatus atque ordines fidei ſuæ commiſſos, ſive illi Eccleſiaſtici ſint, ſive civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes gladio civili coerceant.*

Scoticana, Art. 18. *poſtremo loco (nota veræ Eccleſiæ eſt) diſciplina Eccleſiſtica rectè adminiſtrata, ſicut Dei verbum præſcribit, ad reprimendum vitium, et vertatem fovendam.* 24. *Inſuper Regum, principum, gubernatorum---eſſe potiſſimum et imprimis Religionis purgationem et conſervationem affirmamus adeo ut non tantum propter civilem politiam, ſed et propter conſervationem veræ religionis, ut Idololatria et ſuperſtitio quævis ſupprimatur, a deo ſint ordinati.* The *Belgick* confeſſion hath the ſame, Art. 30, 31, 32. and 36. *Confeſſio. Auguſtana. nonnulli incommodè commiſcue runt poteſtatem Eccleſiaſticam & poteſtatem gladii.* It diſtinguiſheth well between

between the power of the keyes in the Church, and the power of the sword in the Magistrate. To this agreeth *Confessio Swevica*, Art.13. and *Confessio Bohemica, Saxonica, Basilienſis, Tetrapolitana.*

Amongst our late writers, I should conceive that renowned *Salmasius*, that rich treasure of Antiquity, can stand as one for all to speak for us in this point. *The Emperours* (saith he) *had of old a suffrage in chusing of Metropolitans, Patriarchs, and Popes, and of convocating General Councels*: So as *Ierome* maketh it a Mark of a General Councel, that it was indicted by the Emperour; and there was reason, because, it concerned the consciences of the Magistrate as the Magistrate, what Pastors, Popes, and Doctors there were in their dominions to watch over their souls, and the souls of their subjects. It is true, *de facto, Honorius* the Emperour did ordain *Marcellinus* moderator of the conference at *Carthage* between the Catholicks and the *Donatists*, The Emperours added the force of a civil Law to the Councels: So *Iustinian. Constitut.* 130. *sanxit ut quatuor conciliorum Canones pro legibus haberentur*; Ergo, the Councels had the force of Ecclesiastical Lawes, without the Emperours; But they had not the force of civil Lawes, having civil penalties annexed to them, without the Emperours; *Ergo*, the confirmation of Councels made by the Emperours, were politick and civil confirmations: for the decrees of the Councel of *Ierusalem*, were Ecclesiastical decrees, without the will, Law, and Authority of any Emperour on earth, and laid an Ecclesiastical tye on the Churches, without the Emperour, *Act.* 16. 4, 5. So is that of *Salmasius* to be expounded, as he expoundeth himself. *Principis est leges de Religione condere, de fide Catholicâ, de Episcopis, de Clericis, deque aliis huiusmodi que externam potestatem spectant, sive τὸ ἔξω ἐποκοπῶ circa res et personas Ecclesiasticas, eaque fecere Christiani Imperatores in Ecclesia sui temporis, hæc enim est ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ sive νομοθετικὴ potestas qua principes legum sanctionibus non uni generi sibi subditorum consulere debent, sed in universum, omnibus tam laicis, quam Ecclesiasticis, quatenus Ecclesia est in Repub. et Reip. pars, non Respublica Ecclesiæ.*

Cl. Salmasi. de primatu papæ, Part, 1. *in apparatu*, pag. 288.289. *Hyeronicus Monstra mihi quisnam imperatorum celebrari id concilium iusserit.*

Salmasius in apparatu, pag.292.

Now that Emperours appointed time and place of Synods, which were external circumstances, is clear: But that the Emperours nominated the persons, who should come, appointed an Eccle-

siastical president in the Synod to moderate, and that they defined the number of Bishops, is denied: Except 1. That they did this in a great schisme, and when the Church could not agree amongst themselves: Or 2. In such a general defection, as was under *Arrius*, which was an extraordinary case. 3. That the Emperour requested by Letters, that such and such godly Bishops might come to the Synod, not such: But whereas, *de facto*, he as a Magistrate commanded such to come, and did discharge others under pains to come (except they were other wayes incarcerated and known parties, and so could not be judges) is against the liberty of the Church and the freedom of Synods.

In apparat. pag. 293. 294. So *Salmasius*, *Non igitur leges tantum facere de religione ac fide omnibus observandas, dummodo verbo divino non contraveniant, potest princeps Christianus, vel summus Magistratus, sed etiam suos subditos ad decreta Synodalia observanda quæ verbo Dei conformia sunt, obligare, et Cogere: ubicunque sane imperio opus est pervim agente ac jubente, aut jurisdictione cogente, et coercente, nihil istic habent quod agant verbi Ministri, neque jus agendi ullum, etiamsi de re aut persona Ecclesiastica quæstio sit, aut de religione agatur, sed ad principes aut Magistratus ea vis coactiva et illud jus imperativum et coercivum pertinet.*

There is a Law making (unproper I grant, because declarative in Mortal men, constitutive in the head Christ only) touching Faith and Religion which is politick; but it is when there is a constitute Church, subsequent, not antecedent, and in order to bodily coaction by the sword which is due to the Magistrate: Of this Lawgiving doth *Salmasius* speak as his words clear, and because bodily and externall co-action is not the Churches, therefore the Magistrate as the Magistrate according to *Salmasius*, hath no proper Ecclesiastick power.

In app. p. 298. The reciprocation of subordination of Pastors and Magistrates is clearly taught by *Salmasius* Minister, *Ecclesia principem Christianum ligare et solvere id est, suspendere et excommunicare æque potest ut alium quem libet de grege per illam internam potestatem et ἐποχοωλὼ quam a deo accepit. At princeps rursus potest Episcopum per illam suam exteriorem ἐποχοωλὼ, quæ non animam, sed corpus curat, cogere, coercere, ad officium compellere, si exorbitet, etiam deponere, et abijcere, et exilio punire, vitâ quoque, si meruerit, sententiam, dicere,*

dicere, privare---a principe abjectus Episcopus Ministerij tantum atque officij functionem amittit, atque exercitium intra limites jurisdictionis duntaxat vel ditionis quæ principi subjecta est--at non potestatem, quam in ordinatione accepit, per impositionem manuum, potest cripere princeps, cum nec eam possit dare.

Cum sit duplex potestas Ecclesiastica, altera interna, externa altera, tam peccant qui utramque principi vel Magistratui civili tribunt, quam qui utramque denegant ministro Ecclesiastico. And he proveth that the Pastors have received immediately from Christ, and not from the Magistrate, their internal and external power of governing the Churches.

Josias. Simlerus professor Tigurinus comment. in Exod. 20. *in Mand.* 5. *Magistratuum officium est tollere idola, vi et armis---concionatorum vero ut errorem ostendant, Idololatriam damnent, verbi gladio jugulent, et Magistratum sui officij admoneant in rebus externis tollendis ut Can.* 15. *Concil. Carthag.* 5. p. 303.

Lavater in Ezech. c. 44. *Dominus dicit repellendos a ministerio incircumcisos carne, hoc est, indulgentes libidinibus et incircumcisos corde, hoc est, imbutos pravis opinionibus; collige quanta cura et diligentia requiratur a sacerdotibus, conformiter enim custodibus.*

Lavater in Ezech. 22. 26. *reprehendit in sacerdotibus quod sancta sua violarint, non enim tractarint quemadmodum ipse instituerat. Nam in templo prostabant Idola, sacrificia non legitimè offerebantur ---an non hodie Sacramenta ab adulteris, ebriosis et aleatoribus administrantur?*

Idem in Ezech. 23. 38. *et quum immolassent filios idolis. Si adultera de adulteri stratis surgens rectâ ad maritum suum veniat, et amorem coniugalem simulet, judicium est magnæ impudentiæ---redeuntes a valle Hinnon et cultu dæmonum, tanquam re bene gesta, cruentis manibus templum ingrediebantur citra conscientiam oraturi.*

Joan. Wolphius *in Nehemiam ait,* c. 2. v. 20. *ædificatores Ecclesiæ nihil agere debere quam quod in mandatis divinitus datum sit.*

Idem in Ezram, c. 10. *hoc enim exemplo* V.T. *discimus quæ facto opus sit in* N. T. *nempe ut crebris synodis in vitam, in doctrinam et mores, in vocationem Ecclesiastorum inspiciatur.*

Hence it is clear that *Simler, Lavater,* and *Wolphius,* do clearly 1. Difference between the two powers of the Sword and Church. 2. That the Priests in the Old, and Ministers in the New Testament

ment are not to prophane holy things. 3. That by Assemblies and Synods Church-censures are to be dispensed.

Yea, even *Robert. Burhillus de primatu Regio contra Becanum Iesuitam.* c. 10. *sed neque in exteriore jurisdictione, aut excommunicationis aut ordinationis potestatem regi facimus, aut cultus divini novas formulas procudendi, aut dispensandi----adde quod nec jus ei tribuimus, leges suâ solius authoritate ferendi quæ canonum Ecclesiasticorum vim obtineant.*

The mind of *D. Pareus* and *P. Martyr* may be known by what is said, and is cleared in that learned dissertation of *Iac. Trig.* Nor shall I need to burden the Reader with citations of Fathers, Greek and Latine, Doctors, Councels, with all our Protestant Divines, *Luther, Calvin, Beza, Farel, Marlorat, Piscator, Sibrandas, Iunius, Gomarus, Trelcatius, Bucanus*, &c. which were easie to do if not needlesse, and acknowledged by the Adversary. I have also in answering *Erastus* (I hope) answered all that Mr. *Prinne* hath said, either in his questions, or vindication; because most of all he hath (I speak it not to diminish or detract from the learning of that reverend man, far lesse to irritate) is fully to be seen in *Erastus*: so that in answering *Erastus*, I hope, that ingenuous, zealous, and learned Divine will *Acquiesce*. The Lord establish *Ierusalem* and make her a peaceable habitation.

FINIS.

AN INTRODVCTION To the Doctrine of Scandal.

Whether or no things indifferent can be commanded becauſe indifferent?

Hat ever things are commanded under the tenor of things indifferent, and yet are not indifferent, are not lawful, nor can be in reaſon commanded: for ſo ſhould they be of their nature both indifferent, and not indifferent: But humane Ceremonies are ſuch; Ergo, *they are not lawful.*

Indifferent things Baſilius *calleth them* τὰ ἐν μέσῳ Nazianz. τὰ ἐν μέσῳ κείμενα; *ſo* Laertius, *and* Gellius *ſaith the ſame of them. Things indifferent cannot be good, but eſſentially neither good nor ill, and if they be not good, they cannot be apt to edifie, and ſo fall not within the compaſſe of things which can be commanded by Rulers.*

There is a twofold matter of a Church conſtitution, the one remote, the other nearer: The remote matter of Church conſtitutions are things indifferent, to wit, mens actions and the circumſtances thereof; and ſo they are the matter of Gods Laws; for all our actions Phyſi-

cally

Course of conformity pag. 115. Indifferent things as such: not the matter of a Church constitution.

cally considered to know, believe, will, love, joy, fear, speak, walk, laugh, &c. are indifferent in themselves; but God in the Law of Nature, and his positive Divine Law hath made them good or evil, and hath put his determination legal upon them. But no indifferent action, as it is such, can be the neareſt matter of any Church-conſtitution: No wiſe man would ſay that the Church might make a Law, that all ſhould caſt ſtones in the water; *yet God might make a Law thereof. For what actions hath no good, nor lawfulneſſe, nor aptitude to edifie in themſelves, theſe the will of man can never make good, lawful, and apt to edifie, becauſe onely God, whoſe will is the prime rule of all goodneſſe, can create moral goodnes in actions:* not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, *is only good, becauſe God hath ſo appointed in his Law, and* to eat of the fruit of that tree, *had been as lawful and juſt, as not to eat, if God had commanded eating thereof, under promiſes and threatnings.* 2. *Hence it followeth that all actions and circumſtances of their nature indifferent, muſt loſe that indifferency, and receive from God ſome goodneſſe, and aptneſſe to edifie, before they can be the reaſonable and neareſt matter of any Civil or Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution; becauſe what rulers can in Law and reaſon command, that they muſt will as good and apt to edifie, before they can bind others to will it. But neither the will of a ruler, nor the will of any other can lawfully will a thing indifferent, as it is ſuch: for a thing indifferent as it is ſuch, is neither good nor evil, and the object of the will is alwayes good.* 3. Rulers commandeth as Gods Miniſters for our good, *Rom.* 13. 4. Ergo, *the means and actions injoyned for the compaſſing of this end muſt be good, for if the end be good, the means as the means muſt be good;* Ergo, *they cannot be indifferent.*

Things indifferent cannot be enacted as a Law, except they were indifferent to all, to both weak and wilful; for remaining evil, to ſome they are ſcandalous, and cannot be commanded, except rulers would command ſinful actions.

The Apoſtles would make no Laws at all of things indifferent, except in the caſe of ſcandal, neither can our Ceremonies be indifferent. 1. *Becauſe they are ſacred myſtical ſignes teaching us ſome duties to God.* 2. *They are worſhip, and means tending to the honour of God, and being uſed for the honour of an Idol, as they are uſed by us, they ſhould be the religious honour of an Idol.* 3. *They are pre-*

tended

tended to be means apt to edifie. Ergo, *They are not in their use indifferent.* 4. *The use of Ceremonies are Moral actions of man, not warranted by Gods Word.* Ergo, *They are unlawful, and so not indifferent. If then nothing be good, because Rulers command it; but, by the contrary, they do lawfully command it, because it is good. The Churches power, is one and the same, in things indifferent, and necessary in matters of Doctrine, Discipline, and Order; for in both, the Church doth not create goodnesse, but doth by the Light of the Word, or (which is a part of the Word) by natures Light, finde pre-existent goodnesse in Doctrine, Discipline, and matters of Order. Therefore Will of Authority, as Will, hath no power to dispose of the least Circumstance of time, place or person; but the Churches power is Ministerial, and determined to what is good, expedient, and convenient.*

Object. Humane Actions according to their specifice nature may be indifferent in Gods Worship: For example, to pray to God in the morning, in your Bed, or out of it; in the House, or in the Fields; to Preach the Word in this, or that habit, in a Gown, or in a Cloak; these are actions in their kinde indifferent, because they are neither commanded, nor forbidden; for that is according to the kinde of action good, which is so commanded of God, that it is unlawful to neglect it, or to do any thing repugnant to it, as to love God and our Neighbour; and that is evil according to its kinde, which is so forbidden by Gods Law, as it is not lawful to do it, or command it in any sort; so it is evil to blaspheme God, to commit adultery. So *Forbs.* Doct. *Forb.* in Ireni. l. 1. c. 12. num. 13.

Ans. *In the Field, or in the Bed, Cloathed With Gown or Cloak, when We Pray or Preach, are meer Accidents and Circumstances of praying and preaching, and We grant them to be variable and indifferent; howbeit, they admit of Regulation Moral, and so are not simply indifferent; for to pray in the Fields and Streets, to be seen of men, is vain-glory. But I hope they are not indifferent in your meaning, as are Surplice, Holydays, &c. For you will not say the Church may make Laws that no Prayers be but in the Fields, no Preaching except the Preacher be cloathed with a Cloak. 2. It is not good Logick to say,* To pray in House or Field, is an action according to its kinde, neither good nor evil; *When as it is an individual action, contracted to such a place, House or Field, because Field or House are indifferent in Prayer. To pray is not indifferent according to its kinde; because Accidents of Actions are indifferent; it followeth not that the action is indifferent, for then the Doctors Opinion, maketh an Act of loving God, and beleeving in Christ, indifferent in its kinde; for it is as indifferent to love God in the Field, as in the House, and to love him while you are cloathed with a Gown, as with a Cloak:* As it is indifferent to pray, in House or Field, cloathed with Gown, or Cloak; *so to love God, and the most necessary actions in the World* hic & nunc, *in this time or in this place, shall* Actions are not indifferent, because their circumstances are indifferent.

be actions according to their nature, neither good, nor evil, but indifferent, which is against the Doctors own Distinction. 3. *Place or habit doth not constitute Praying, and Preaching in their specifice nature; that were a wonder; for their Objects do constitute their nature, and their Objects are God and Gods Word; and if they be indifferent according to their nature, it shall be indifferent to pray to God, or to some other thing, possibly an Idol. Nay, if Actions good of their own nature, such as to Pray, or Preach, be made indifferent according to their kinde, because cloathed with indifferent Circumstances of time and place, and habit; then by that same reason, Actions of their own nature evil, as to murther, commit adultery, should also become indifferent, from these Circumstances; then should it be indifferent to kill in House, or Field, and indifferent according to its kinde, which is most absurd.*

D. Forbesius in Irenic. l. 1. cap. 13. fig. 15.

Object. Howbeit it be objected, that every voluntary action is either honest, or not honest, yet there are some things honest, that are indifferent and free: For there are two kindes of honest things, 1. Some honest and necessary things, as all the duties commanded in Gods Law, the contrary of these polluteth a man before God, and they are formally, positively, and inclusively laudable, and commendeth men before God, and are rewarded. This way every voluntary action is not either honest, or unhonest; for there is a middle betwixt these two, to wit, something honest and lawful, but not necessary, but morally free, as Marriage, which commendeth not a man to God, so that he is therefore rewarded; neither doth the contrary, to wit, non-marriage pollute a man before God, or is blame-worthy, because marriage is onely negatively honest, *Honestum irreprehensibile, honestum exclusive, & honestum per compossibilitatem cum honesto formali & positivo.* So marriage is neither positively honest, nor unhonest, but free morally. Neither is marriage necessary by absolute necessity, or necessity that toucheth the action; for men may marry, and not to marry is no sin, onely marrying is necessary by a conditional necessity, 1 *Cor.* 7.39. A Widow is free to marry whom she will, but with this condition, That she marry in the Lord; the necessity toucheth not the action, but the manner of the action. And this necessity of the manner or goodness of the action of marriage, doth not make the action necessary, but leaveth it as free to men to marry, or not to marry; and so there are some actions according to the spece or nature, that are indifferent, and not unhonest, yet lawful. So Doctor *Forbs.*

Marrying not indifferent, as the Doctor supposeth.

Answ. 1. *Marriage hath something in it natural, even before the Fall.* It was naturally good, that man should not be alone, *and this way, before, and after the Fall, Marriage in the ground that maketh it necessary, which is an aptitude and inclination to procreation, is most necessary; and so now, after the Fall of man, all that* burneth and marrieth not, *despiseth Gods remedy of lust, and sinneth; and so by necessity of Gods command in the Law of nature, and repeated by the Apostle,* 1 Cor. 7. 2, 9. *it is necessary* in individuo: *And although, that which is meerly natural in marriage, as the Act of marriage according to the substance, be not formally laudable, and rewarded, because of the naturality thereof; yet*

it

it is not for that free or indifferent. 2. *And when the Doctor saith,* That marriage is indifferent in its nature, and free; so that there is no necessity of the action, but onely of the goodnesse of the action, *he speaketh wonders: For howbeit, marriage be indifferent by a Metaphysical indifferency of contrahibility to such and such persons, because marriage may be in some, without sin, and no-marriage may also be in other some, without sin; and so praying is indifferent; it is in some without sin, and not-praying is in some also without sin, when the man is necessitated to some other action, either Civil, Natural or Supernatural; yet marriage is not Morally or Theologically indifferent: So as to marry, or not marry, is a matter of a mans free choice, and of his own free-will not obnoxious to any binding Law, as is kneeling, not-kneeling, crossing, not-crossing, in the minde of our Adversaries.* 1. *If it were morally indifferent to marry, or not to marry, Rulers might make Laws either commanding all to marry, or none to marry, or some to marry; some not to marry, which were no small tyranny, and the very doctrine of Devils.* 2. *The gift of Continency, is to some a commandment of God, that they marry not, and burning is to some a commandment, obliging them in conscience to marry, else they sin; therefore to marry, or not to marry, is necessary to all men, or then unlawful, and so not indifferent, as our* Divines *teach against Papists, their Supercrogatorie Works. The Lords calling of any to suffer for his Truth, is instead of a command of God; though the man might be saved, though he suffer not for the Truth.* 3. *If there be no necessitie in marrying, but onely conditional in the manner of marrying, then all mankinde without sin might abstain from marrying, which is most absurd.* 4. *The place* 1 Cor. 7. 39. *saith not, that a Widow is under no necessitie of marrying, but onely under a necessity of well and spiritual marrying. For the libertie that the Widow hath there, is not, that it is indifferent to her to marry, or not to marry; for since our Adversaries teach, That Rulers may make Laws in things indifferent; they might then make a Law that no Widows shall marry, which were vile tyrannie. But the libertie* that the Widow hath to marry whom she will, *is opposed onely to a Law and Obligation Matrimonial, that she was under, while her Husband did live. And the words clearly speaketh onely of this freedom, not of Moral freedom of indifference, from all Law of God necessitating her to marry:* The Wife is bound by the Law, as long as her Husband liveth; but if her Husband be dead, she is at liberty to marry whom she will, onely in the Lord. *But there are no smal oddes betwixt libertie to marry this or that man, because the Husband is dead, of which libertie onely the Apostle speaketh; and liberty, and indifference without all restraint of Gods Law*

Indifference Metaphysical and Theological.

to marry at all, or not to marry: This latter libertie, the Scripture speaketh not of, onely the Doctor alleageth it.

Doctor *Forb.* 16. num. 17.

Object. Kneeling at the Sacrament, howbeit, antecedente and immediately it be not necessary by Gods Law; yet consequently, and by the mediation of lawful Authority, it is now necessary to us, not by necessity of the thing it self, but by necessity of obedience, order, and peace; and so according to the practice, it is for the time necessary by Gods Law, and cannot be omitted without sin. So *Forbes.*

Necessity of obeying the Church, in things onely necessary for the Churches Commandment, is neither a lawful, nor an obliging necessity.

Answ. *Necessitie of obeying the Church can make nothing necessary and good, for the Church commandeth it, because it is necessary and good, and it hath not goodnesse, necessitie and aptnesse to edifie from mens Will, and the Churches commandment.* 2. *I ask if no kneeling, now in* Scotland *laying aside the respect of Authority and Law, be in it self undecent, and unapt to edifie; if not, then the Church hath no more ground and reason for order and decency in our Ceremonies (for what I say of one, holdeth true in all) then there is for the want of Ceremonies; and if that be true, the sole Will and lust of Authority maketh our Ceremonies lawful: What can Romish impudence give more to the Man of sin? But if there be unorderlinesse and indecency in our Ceremonies, then kneeling now must be sin, even laying aside the respect of Humane Laws.* 3. *It is strange Divinity,* That that which is no sin, of it self, cannot be omitted without sin, for the sole will and pleasure of men. *Humane Authority then may make it sin,* not to rub our Beards, not to claw our Heads, *When We come to the Church to hear Gods Word. If Humane Authority can make an indifferent Act lawful, and the omission of it, sinful; they may make all the indifferent Acts in the World lawful Acts, they might then make piping, leaping, laughing Acts of Divine Worship, and might make a Decalogue of their own: And if they may make an indifferent Act to be sin, if it be omitted, they may by as good reason, make sinful Acts, as Adulterie, Incest, Murther, Robbery, to be lawful Acts; For if mans inhibiting will be the formal reason of sin, then his commanding will must be the formal reason of obedience: And so Rulers might command Murther, Robbery, Incest, Blasphemy.*

Doctor *Forbes.*

Object. We may perform an individual act coming from deliberate will, and that without sin, and we may omit the same without sin: Whether we practise these indifferent actions, or omit them, we should refer both practice and omission to Gods glory; and these actions we call indifferent or free, (as indifferent and free is opposed to that which is morally necessary) which are either necessary to be done, or necessary to be omitted, by necessity of a Divine Law, Howbeit, every action that is not of Faith be sin, *Rom.* 14. 23. Yet the faith whereby I beleeve this action is necessary, and must be done, is not necessary to the eschewing of sin. But if I do it, that I do it in Faith, and for Gods glory, is necessary; but the necessity of the goodnesse of the action doth not make the action necessary; for it were to lay a yoak of continual doubting upon mens conscience, if they should beleeve every

individual

individual act, that they do, to be necessary; for whether should they turn them, while they think of doing, or not doing these actions, that they know to be commanded by no Word of God? That a Widow marry in the Lord, if she marry, is necessary; but it is not necessary, that she marry, but it is indifferent to her, to marry, or not to marry. Doctor Forbes.

Actions individual meerly indifferent, cannot be done in Faith.

Answ. *It is a contradiction, that an action individual, should be indifferent, and so neither good, nor evil, and yet done in Faith, and referred to Gods glory: For the ground of doing, which is Faith, and the end, which is Gods glory, are individual properties necessarily concurring to the individuation of the Action Moral.* 2. *An action individual, that is meerly indifferent, and so without sin may be performed, without sin, or omitted without sin, cannot be an action of Faith referred to Gods glory: For what may be done without sin, and may not be done without sin, is a will-action, and wanteth all necessitie of reason, and so is an idle and sinful action; but a sinful action may be done in fancy, but in Faith it cannot be done; it may, in the vain intention of the doer, be referred to Gods glory,* In intentione erronea operantis, *but* ex conditione operis, *according to the nature of the Work it serveth not for Gods glory. This way to cast stones in the Water, should be of Faith, and referred to Gods glory: But shall I beleeve I am doing in Faith, and glorifying God, when I am casting stones in the Water, and I have as good reason not to cast at all? If one will-action that may be done, and may not be done, may be of Faith, and referred to Gods glory, then may they all be of Faith, and referred to Gods glory: This is a laughter, rather then Divinitie.* 3. *I cannot beleeve that an action that hath as good reason to be omitted, as to be done, can be acceptable to God, because I have no ground for my Faith; for my Faith here leaneth neither on Scripture, nor on Reason, but there is no reason why the action should rather be, nor not be, because it is indifferent; yea, crossing and kneeling of themselves shall be of Faith, because I beleeve them to be of Faith: But it is a vain thing to say, that Faith maketh its object.* 4. *There are no actions in the World, but they have all their Moral necessitie from their intrinsecal goodnesse: For from whence is it necessary to love God, but from the intrinsecal goodnesse, that the love of God hath from Gods command? For there is no necessitie an action to be at all; yea, it is idle and superfluous, if there be no goodnesse in it at all. If then crossing and kneeling, (laying aside the respect of Humane Laws commanding them) have no necessitie Moral, from any Commandment of God, why they should be at all, their necessitie must be all from mans will: this is tyranny in Rulers, for their sole pleasure to command, under the heaviest pain, things that have no necessitie at all, but their will.* 5. *Neither is it any yoak to mens conscience, to square all*

their Moral Action by Gods Word, and so to see (according as it is Written) *before they venture upon any Action Moral. It is libertie to keep Gods Way accuratelj.*

Doct. *Forbes.* I-ren. l. 1 c. 13. fig. 11.

Object. In general, no particular action is necessary, the goodnesse whereof that is commended and rewarded of God, may as well be had by the omission of that action, or by an other action, as by the doing of it; but such an action in the individual use is free, and indifferent; but if the goodnesse necessary cannot be had at all, without that particular action, then the action in the individual use is necessary, although according to its nature, it be possibly indifferent. So to us now to kneel at the Supper, is necessary, that we may obtain the necessary good of due Obedience, and decent Vniformity, and eschue the contempt of Authority, Schism, and Confusion. *Forbes.*

Answ. 1. *By goodnesse here, the Doctor meaneth,* Concomitant and general goodnesse, *which maketh not the action necessary to be done, and so it hath no goodnesse intrinsecal, but is an idle action, and yet it may be done, or not done without sin; and when it is done, it is done upon no other motive, but the meer Will and pleasure of the doer: We have hereby the Doctors learning, Such an idle action done in Faith, and done for Gods glory.* 2. *All our Ceremonies in their use, crossing, kneeling, wearing of Surplice, have no intrinsecal goodnesse, no internal moral equity of Order, Decency, and aptnesse to Edifie, wherefore it is necessary they should be done; the doing of them in Faith, and for Gods glory, may be obtained as well by none-kneeling, none-crossing, none-Surplice. This is no small dash to the credit of* Pearth Assembly; *for they saw no goodnesse in the Articles, but that which as well might have been obtained without them. Hence except the goodnesse of pleasing* King James, *they had no more reason for the Ceremonies, then to make an* Act *that all Ministers shall go to the Foot-Ball, the third day of* May. 3. *Then the meer pleasure of the King hath made kneeling necessary, and good obedience to the fifth Commandment, mens Will as Will so is the onely formal reason of obedience to the ten Commandments, or disobedience.* 4. *Then we may of Faith, and for Gods glory, refuse the Ceremonies, if it be the Kings Will; and in that point, the fifth Commandment standeth or falleth at the nod of the Kings Will. Such Mercenary Divinitie becometh not the lovers of Reformation.*

Doct. *Forbes.*

Object. There is a twofold malice in actions, One that layeth a moral impediment on the act, so that it cannot be performed without sin: So to eschue the malice that is in adultery, we must eschue the act of adultery; this malice polluteth the act, and should hinder the act: There is another malice that polluteth the act, but doth not morally hinder the act, As when one feedeth the poor for vain-glory, vain-glory polluteth the act, but hindereth it not: Vain-glory should be laid aside, and the poor fed. If one kneel at the Supper, thinking it not lawful to kneel before Creatures, his kneeling is evil; but the evil in it doth onely pollute the act, and make it sinful, but doth not morally hinder kneeling, because contumacious ignor-

ance,

ance, pride, and contempt of Authority ſhould be laid aſide: Men ſhould be docil, and ſee the lawfulneſſe of it, and obey the Church. *Forbs.*

Anſw. *In things indifferent, the very malice adhering to the practice of them, howbeit, it adhere not inſeparably to them, maketh the practice damnable: For eating* Rom. 14. *before a Weak Brother, Whoſe Weakneſſe might have been removed, if he would be docil, and know that their is no creature now unclean, is murther,* Rom. 14. 14. *Therefore, ſuppoſe all the* Kings *and* General Aſſemblies *on Earth, ſhould command one to eat in that caſe, before the Weak Brother, they were to be diſobeyed; and ſo the Doctor freeth us, that We cannot kneel at the Lords Supper. 2. Rulers may not make laws of things having no neceſſitie of Goodneſſe, Decency, and aptneſſe to Edifie, and onely good, becauſe they Will, When they ſee of neceſſitie, theſe laws ſhall inevitably ruine many ſouls; for that is to have more regard to their own Will, then to the ſalvation of peoples ſouls, Whereas even* Chriſt pleaſed not himſelf. 3. *Many Weak are uncapable of all Reaſons or Arguments that can free our kneeling of Idolatry.* Ergo, *They ſhould abſtain, and not kneel With a doubting conſcience; better not eat as eat, With a doubting conſcience,* Rom. 14. 23. 4. *Pride and contempt are onely ſeen to God: Prelates have no place to puniſh heart-acts, they are to prove by two Witneſſes, the Malice, and Pride, and Contempt of Authoritie; but this is inviſible to mens eies, refuſal of obedience to Canons touching indifferent things, the neceſſitie Whereof (as the Doctor muſt ſay), cometh onely from mans Will, cannot be contempt: The neglect of a command of God, is indeed a virtual contempt of the Majeſtie, Authoritie, Power, and Juſtice of God, becauſe a command of God hath Eſſentially, Equitie, and Juſtice in it, from Gods commanding Will: But a command of a thing indifferent, that may as well, Without ſin be left undone, as done, (as our Doctor ſaith of our Ceremonies) can never have equitie or goodneſſe from Humane Authoritie; and I never contemn Humane Authoritie, except I contemn the juſt Laws made by Humane Authoritie* *.

Forbeſ. ib. n. 13. The unlawfulneſs even inſeparably adhering toactions that are indifferent, maketh them unlawful.

* *Suarez* tom. de legib. l. 3. c. 18: Formaliter autem cõmittitur hoc vitiũ (contemptus) quando ex directâ intentione ad hoc aliquid fit, ut alter deſpiciatur, aut deſpici oſtendatur. *Vaſquez*, tom. 2. diſp. 158. cap. 4. Contemptus eſt in ſolâ directâ intentione non parendi, in qua eſt ſpeciale mandatum inobedientiæ, qua quis directo animo non obedit ſuperiori, ut ei directe opponatur ex dedignatione quadam, quam habet, quod ei ſubditus ſit. *Aquinas* 22. q. 168. art. 9. 3. Contemnere eſt nolle ſubjici legi ex ſuperbia.

Object. Of things alike lawful and convenient; for example, ſitting at the Lords Table, or not ſitting, we are bound to the one rather then to the other, for lawful Authorities command; for conveniency and goodneſſe in external circumſtances ſtandeth not in ſueh an indiviſible point, but there may be circumſtances good, better, and beſt; a geſture, a day, a habit, may be ſo good and convenient, as another geſture, another day, another habit, are as good and convenient; in which caſe, either no habit, no day, no geſture at all, ſhall be in Gods Worſhip, which were impoſſible; elſe of two Circumſtances, both of three degrees of goodneſſe, one ſhall be choſen by the ſole Will of Authority; and ſo people muſt follow one or-

der, rather then another as good, for the sole Will of Authority, without any prevalent reason in the thing commanded.

How exsuperancy of necessity of goodness is to sway the will of Rulers and people.

Answ. 1. *In such a case as that, where two Circumstances, both of three degrees of goodnesse occurreth, Rulers can reasonably tie people to neither, but leave it alternatively, to their liberty; for why should liberty be restrained, where necessity of order, and decency, doth not necessitate the Rulers will?* 2. *In such a case the Rulers will, as will, should not be the formal cause, why one is enacted rather then another; but the Rulers will led by a reason from conveniency, and so there were a prevalent reason, for the one rather then the other.* 3. *I deny that such a Metaphysical case of two things every way of alike conveniency can fall out, as the matter of a grave and weighty* Church-constitution; *For natures Light, rules of Prudence, Piety, Charity, and Sobriety shall ever finde out, and discover an exsuperancy of goodnesse and conveniency, of one above another.* 4. *Granting there be three degrees of goodnesse and conveniency in sitting, and two degrees of goodnesse and conveniency in kneeling; in this case the object necessitateth the Rulers will to command sitting, and refuse kneeling.* 1. *Because good being the formal object of a reasonable Will, in both Rulers and people; that which partaketh more of the nature of Good, is first to be chosen.* Ergo, *The Rulers will is determinated and morally necessitated to a circumstance of three degrees, before a circumstance of two degrees; and we obey for the goodnesse of the thing commanded, and not for the will of the Rulers.* 2. *If people obey, and so embrace a Circumstance of two degrees, and refuse a convenient circumstance of three degrees; they either make this choice for the goodnesse and conveniency of the Circumstance, or for the meer Will of Authority; the former cannot be said, because of two Goods, known to be so, the one of three degrees, and the other of two degrees; the Will cannot reasonably choose the lesse good, because a lesse good known as a lesse good, is evil, and the Will cannot reasonably choose known evil: A lesse good is a good with a defect, and so morally evil; if then Rulers cannot choose evil, they cannot reasonably command others to choose it; if the latter be said, the choice of people is reasonlesse, and their conscience resteth upon the meer Will of Authority, which is slavish obedience. How are we then bidden,* try all things?

1 Thes. 5. 21. 1 Ioh. 4. 1.

Object. In matters plainly determined by Scripture, Rulers are to follow the Word of God; but in matters circumstantial or indifferent, where Scripture saith neither for the one side, nor for the other, what Rulers thinketh good, is to be followed, there being no evil nor impiety in that which they command.

The will of Rulers not a law to us in things indifferent.

Answ. 1. *This is to make Rulers in matters of Salvation lyable to the* Scriptures of God; *but in matters which men call indifferent to make them Popes, and to hang our consciences upon their sleeve, which is most absurd.* 1. *Because* Paul *in matters most indifferent of dayes, and meats, would not have the Romans to hang upon his judgement; but will rule both their practice, and his own, by the Law of nature. Murther not, Scandalize not.* 2. What Rulers thinketh good *is not a rule for Constitutions, and for peoples obedience in matters circumstantial; but the rule of Rulers here in making Laws, and of people in obeying Laws, is goodnesse it self, Order, Decency, aptitude to Edifie, in things that they command; for it were strange, if in matters, that they call of salvation, not thoughts, but the Word of God should rule and square* Canon-makers, *but in matters indifferent, their thoughts should be a Law.* 3. Scripture *and the Law of nature, and right reason, which is a deduction from* Scripture, *is able sufficiently in all Canons and Constitutions to regulate both Rulers and people, and to determine what is convenient in Circumstances; and the* Lord *here is an infallible Judge, speaking in his Word, as he is in all matters, which they call Fundamental; yea, the* Scripture *shall be imperfect in the duties of the second Table, if it do not determine what is active scandal, or soul-murther, as it doth determine what is Idolatry, what is lawful Worship.*

A Dispute

A Disputе touching Scandall and Christian libertie.

Quest. I. Concerning Scandall.

Whether or not Ceremonies, and the use of things not necessarie in Gods *worship, when they Scandalize, be unlawfull?*

I Doe the more willingly enter this Dispute, and with reverence to the more learned, shall examine the Doctrine of the late Doctors of *Aberdene* in their *Duplyes*. Because I occasioned their thoughts touching Scandall, by a private dispute of the nature of Scandall, which I undertooke while I was confined in *Aberdene*, with one of the chief Doctors.

Our 10 *Argument.* Ceremonies and things not necessarie in *Gods* worship fail against Charitie, by the grievous cryme of Scandall. *Arg.* 10.

The practice of things indifferent, and not necessarie, is then unlawfull, when from thence ariseth the scandall or occasion of the ruine of our Brother.

But from the practice of Ceremonies and things not necessarie ariseth Scandall, and occasion of the ruine of our brother. *Ergo*, the practice of such is unlawfull. Observe our Argument leaneth on a ground given, but not granted that the Ceremonies be indifferent, though to us they be evill: I prove the Proposition, 1 *Rom.* 14. 14. *I know and am perswaded by the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of it selfe; but to him that esteemeth any thing unclean, to him it is unclean.* V. 15. *But if thy brother be grieved* (weakened in his Christian race) *Now walkest thou uncharitably, destroy not him with thy meat, for whom* Christ *died.* 20. *For meat destroy not the worke of* God. Then for crossing, kneeling, holy dayes, destroy not him for whom

Christ died, 1 *Cor.*8.9. 1 *Cor.*10.28. So the brazen Serpent must be removed, when it is a scandalous object of Idolatrie, *Ezra* 8.22. *Ezra* for feare of Scandall, will not seeke a band of men of the King, lest the King *should believe the hand of God would not bee with his people*, as he had said, Yet a band of men had been more necessarie, then the Ceremonies. So 2 *King.* 23.10. *Josiah* is commended for defiling Tophet, to prevent occasion of offering Children to *Molech*: for this cause *God* iudgeth an house without Battlement, and the sending abroad a goaring Oxe to be murther, *Dent.*27.28. *Exod.*22.28.29 33. *Exod.*23.3. *Deut.*7.3. and *Levit.*19.14. *Thou shalt not lay a stumbling block before the blind.* Marrying with the Canaanites was forbidden, for the ruine occasioned by that, to the soules of *Gods* people. I prove the Assumption, [a] *Gretzer* saith, *In Ceremonies* Calvinists *are the apes of Catholicks.* 2. If such a worship had been in the Temple or Synagogue, so as the Jewes in the same act might, have worshipped *Jehovah*, and the Canaanites Baall or Dagon, as at one table the Papists may kneele and adore bread, with the Protestant, receiving the Sacrament, it would be a raigning scandall. 3. Atheists have mocked Religion, for the Surplice, and other Masse-toyes. 4. Papists say Protestants are returning to their Mother *Church of Rome.* 5. Wee cannot in zeale preach against *Popish* traditions, and practise *Popish* Ceremonies. 6. Lascivious carousings, drunkennes, harlatrie, come from observing of holy dayes. That this may be more cleare. 1. The nature of a scandall would bee cleared. 2, The Doctrine of the Apostle *Paul* about Scandall proponed.

(a) *Gretser in sum. cas. conscient. q.* 23. *pag.* 173 *Calvinistæ Catholicorum Simiæ.*

A Scandall *is a word or action, or the omission of both, inordinately spoken or done, whence we know, or ought to know, the fall of weake, wilfull, or both, is occasioned to those, who are within, or without the Church.* 1. It is *a word or deed seene to others.* Sinfull thoughts not being seen, are not publick scandalls, though to the man himselfe they occasion sinne. Hence non-conformitie simply to a thing indifferent, must onely be scandalous, as joyned with contempt, formall contempt in things indifferent, is inward and invisible to men. 2. Omission of words and deeds scandalize. Silence in Preachers, when *Gods* matters go wrong is scandalous: So *Sanches*(b) 3. Not every word & deed doth scandalize,

(b) *Sanches in Decal tom.* 1. *lib.*1.*c.*6.*n.*1.

dalize but such as are done *unorderly*. (c) *Sanches* saith these words and deeds, *Quæ carent rectitudine, which want some morall rectitude*; or as *Aquinas* (d) saith, of themselves are inductive to sinne, doth scandalize: or that (e) *M. Anton. De Dominis Archiep. Spalatens.* saith, *which is inductive to sinne, or the cause of great evill, or hindereth good, as our faith, zeale, love, &c. that scandalizeth.* For though none of these fall out, if the work or word, or omission of either be such, as of it selfe, is apt to scandalize, it is an active scandall. Hence every little scandall is a sinne, either in it selfe, or in the unordinate way of doing it. But what objects are properly scandalous, shall be discussed. 3. When we know such words and deeds doe scandalize, and they be not necessarie to be done, yea, and if wee ought to know; for though the pronnes and proclivitie of our brethren, or others to sinne, be in some respect, *quæstio facti*, yet is it also *quæstio juris*, a question of Law, the ignorance whereof condemneth, when the things themselves are doubtsomely evill, but not necessary to be done; Hence the practice of a thing indifferent, when there be none that probably can be scandalized, and hath some necessitie, is lawfull: as *Colos.* 2.16. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat or drinke, &c.* yet in case of scandall it is unlawfull to eat. See 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. *Eat whatsoever is set before you asking no question for conscience sake.* 28. *But if any say, this is offered in sacrifice, to Idolls, eat not, for his sake who shewed it, for conscience sake -- Conscience, I say, not thine owne, but of others.* Therefore practising of things indifferent, or non-practising, are both lawfull, according as persons are present, who may be scandalized, or not scandalized; but this is in things though in nature indifferent, yet in use having some necessitie, as eating of meats, but the case is otherwayes in things altogether indifferent, as our Ceremonies are, which are supponed to lay no ty on the conscience, before *God*, to incline to either side, as they say, to crosse, or not to crosse, laying aside the Commandement of men. For if no-crossing be all's good, as crossing, then though there be non-scandalized, yet because it is such an action in *Gods* worship, as is acknowledged to be indifferent, and hath appearance of adding to *Gods* word and worship, it is inductive to sinne, and scandalous, though none

(c) *Sanches, ib.*
(d) *Aquinas* 22 *q.* 23 *art* 3 *Quod de sui ratione habet, quod sit inductivum ad peccandum, vel habet similitudinem peccati.*
(e) *Spalatens. de rep. Ecclesiæ, lib.* 1. *c.* 11 *n.* 18.

should hence be *actu secundo*, ruinated, and made to stumble. But if any in *Pauls* time, as the case was, in the *Church* of *Corinth* should eat meates at a table, forbidden in the Law, he not knowing that a *Jew* was there, this may seeme invincible ignorance, because ignorance of a meere fact, not of a law, if that *Jew* should be scandalized through his eating, it should seeme to me, to be scandall taken, but not culpably given. 4. It is said in the definition, *That these inordinate words or deeds occasioneth the fall of others.* 1. Because the will of the scandalized, or his ignorance is the efficacious and neerest cause, why he is scandalized, that is, why he sinneth; actions or words are occasions onely, or causes by accident, for none ought to be scandalized, as none ought to sinne, *ad peccatum nulla est obligatio.* 2 Because, as to be scandalized is sinne, so to scandalize actively is sinne, though actuall scandall follow not, as *Peter* scandalized *Christ* culpably, when he counselled him not to die for sinners, though it was impossible that *Christ* could be scandalized. 5. It is said, (*whereby weake or wilfull, within, or without the Church may be scandalized.*) For I hope to prove that it is no lesse sinne actively to scandalize the wilfull, and malicious, then the weak, though there be degrees of sinning here, and we must eschew things scandalous for their sake who are without the Church.

For the Second, I set down these *Propositions* 1. from *Rom.* 14.

1. *Propos.* The weake are not to be thraled in judgement, or practice in thornie and intricate disputes, in matters indifferent. This is cleare *Rom.* 14. *v.* 1. *Ergo* When people know not mistie distinctions of *relative* and *absolute* adoration, of worship *essentiall* or *accidentall*, they are not to be here thraled by a Law to practice Ceremonies humane.

2 *Propos.* If a weake one eat herbs, fearing the practice of things forbidden by *Gods* law, he is commended, and his abstinence praise-worthy, as *Rom.* 14. *v.* 2. 3. and he ought not to be judged, and so ought not to be awed by a Law. Then abstinence and non-conformitie is lawfull in such a case.

3. *Propos.* He that eateth, he that eateth not; he that practiseth, he that practiseth not indifferent things, is not to be judged. 1. *God* hath received the eater. 2. You are not to judge

anothe

another mans servant. It is against the Law of Nations. 3. If the weake fall, God *is able to raise them.* *Ergo*, if he be not to be judged, as a contemner of *Gods* law in things indifferent, farre lesse should he be judged, by the *Church* law.

4. *Propos.* Observers of dayes, or non-observers of dayes should have certaintie of Faith in these indifferent things; *Ergo*, the light of the Word should lead Rulers, and People here, *v.*5. in things indifferent.

5. *Propos.* The observer of indifferent things, as dayes in that case at *Rome*, and the non-observers of dayes should not trouble one another, because both are to observe, and not observe indifferent things, for *Gods* glory. 1. *Both gives thankes.* 2. *Both liveth and dieth as Christs, for* Gods *glorie.* 6.7.8.9. Therefore *Gods* glorie is the end that ruleth the use of Ceremonies, as they are indifferent.

*Propos.*6. *v.*10.11.12. a Christian should not condemne a *Jew*, nor one brother another, in things indifferent. 1. Because we are brethren. 2. Because it is *Christs* place to judge, and condemne. 3. Because every man must give an account for himself. *Ergo*, Lawes of Rulers to condemne or punish, are not to be made in such cases.

*Propos.*7. *v.*13. When the use of things indifferent is a stumbling block and scandall to our brethren, they are against charitie and unlawfull.

*Propos.*8. *v.*14. there is a *Prolepsis.* Meats clean, or not clean, may be eaten, but all meats are clean; and *Paul* is perswaded of that by *Iesus Christ.* *Ergo*, The Apostle answereth, 1. by denying the *major Proposition* in two cases, and setteth downe a distinction. *All things are clean in themselves*, but they become unclean, in two cases. 1. If one weake in the faith believe, that the meat, that he eateth, is against the word of *God, the meat to him is unclean.* 2. If he eat before, one that believeth it is forbidden in *Gods* Law, to eat such meats, his eating is a stumbling blocke to the weake. But one might say, It is a taken Scandall, and not given: for it is lawfull to eat, thy brother deemeth it unlawfull out of ignorance of Christian libertie, so say Formalists. *Ceremonies be indifferent; if any offend at the use of them, it is a scandall taken, not given.* O but *Paul* forbiddeth to scandalize, or to eat.

Hence the 9. *Propositi.* The use of things indifferent, as Ceremonies, before any Law be made of them, by confession of Formalists, is indifferent, and may be done, and not done, but if they scandalize, *Paul* proveth by eight arguments they are unlawfull. 1. It fighteth with Charitie, *that for meat, so little a thing*, for the knot of a straw, a Ceremonie, thou slay thy brother, *for whom Christ died. v.* 15. Where these reasons be. 1. It is uncharitable walking. 2. It is murther, *slay not him.* 3. It is contrary to *Christs* love, who died for thy brother. 4. It maketh Religion and Christian libertie, to be evill spoken of, *v.* 16. 5. From the nature of these things, which are indifferent, these in which the *Kingdome of* God *consisteth not*, as Meats and Surplice. crossing kneeling, *&c.* when they scandalize, ought to be omitted, as being against righteousnes, and being sinnes of murther. 2. Against Peace, sinnes of contention, 3. against *joy of the Holy Ghost*, making sad, and discouraging thy brother in his Christian race, and he that serveth *God* in peace and righteousnesse, and joy is acceptable, *v.* 18. 6. The use of things indifferent in case of scandall conduce not to peace and edification, *v.* 19. 7. It is a destroying of the worke of *God*, *v.* 20. illustrated by a repeated *prolepsis*, but the meat is clean; yea, but (saith *Paul*) it is evill, and so morally unclean to him that eateth with offence, *v.* 20. 8. *Ab æquo & bono*, we are to doe good, but to eat and drink with the scandalizing of our brother, and to practise Ceremonies is not *Good.*

Propositi. 10. The practising of things indifferent, or Ceremonies for the very showing of the faith, that we have Christian libertie to practise, or not practise in the case of scandall, is not lawfull, *v.* 22. set downe by a *prolepsis*, *Keep the faith of thy Christian libertie* (in case of scandall) to thy selfe, and to *God.*

Propositi. 11. In the use of things indifferent, we are to allow our selves, that is to have the approbation of our Conscience, that what we doe is lawfull, *v.* 22.

Propositi 12. He that practiseth indifferent things, with a doubting conscience, and not in faith, sinneth, and is condemned, *v.* 23.

1 *Cor.* 6 *v.* 12 *All things* (indifferent) *are lawfull in themselves, but they are not expedient.* If we be brought under the power

power or band of them by law. *Ergo*, in the meanes of worship, not onely must we see what is lawfull, but also what is profitable and conducing to the end. He reasoneth upon a given, but not granted hypothesis, that Fornication is indifferent, as the Gentiles taught, as we doe in the matter of Ceremonies.

1 *Cor.7.v.6. But this I speake by permission, not of Commandement. Ergo* in things, in which *God* hath granted us libertie, to doe, or not to doe, permission hath place, not obliedging necessitie, or penall lawes.

13 *Proposit.* There cannot be commanding Lawes in things that are politickly good, or evill, according to the individuall complexion, temperature, or gifts of singular men, to marry, or not to marry, cannot be commanded, for where *God* looseth, no power on earth can bind, *v.*33.

1 *Cor.8.v.7. Paul* condemneth them in the use of their libertie Christian, *Howbeit there be not in every man this knowledge*, then that Rulers may make lawes in things indifferent, without scandall, they must remove ignorance. 2. If there be but one person weake (*there is not in every man that knowledge*) in knowledge, a Law obliedging all, in things indifferent cannot be made.

V.8. There is a definition of a thing indifferent. *It is a thing that commendeth us not to* God, *which neither helpeth, nor hindereth pietie, nor maketh a man better, or worse before God.* Then Ceremonies pretended to be for order, decencie, edification, to stirre up the dull minde to spirituall duties, cannot be things indifferent.

Hence observe 1. The materialls of worship, as linnen, cloathes, habites, gestures may be in their physicall consideration indifferent, but as applyed by formulistes, they cannot be indifferent, for in their use, kneeling appropriated to sacramentall bread, linnen appropriated to the body of a Priest, while he officiateth, cannot be but religious or prophane. 2. If *God* command gestures, he commandeth this gesture, *hic & nunc.* If in generall, stealing be forbidden, then for *Achan*, to steale this Babylonish garment, must be forbidden. 3. It seemeth to have been after-noon with *Henry Lesly* (*a*) or after cuppes, when he saith, if Papists and Protestants be two divers kindes of

(*a*) Pretended *Hen. Lesly*, Bishop of *Down.* authoritie of the Church, *pag.* 144.

of worshippers, *then their actions of worship must be indifferent, as be their agents*, for actions are distinguished by their objects and ends, Papists in kneeling worship their *God* of bread, we in kneeling at the Sacrament worship the true *God*. For when a *Turk* and a *Christian* doe both worship *Dagon*, it is the same Idolatrie, though Turcisme and Christianisme be different religions. Though kneeling to an Image, the similitude of *God*, and that same kneeling to *Jehovah* represented in that similitude, *Es.* 44. *v.* 8. make one formall object, the *Image* the materiall, *Jehovah* the formall object, yet is it idolatrie. 4. Our circumstances of time and place, cannot properly be called indifferent, for they may be considered two wayes. 1 Physically. 2 Religiously. Physically. The Commandement injoyning a thing, injoyneth also time and place convenient, he that saith (*tho. shalt not kill*) in that same very Commandement said (*Cain, thou shalt not kill* Abel, *in this place of the field, at this time*,) so to believe, and to believe in this time and place, falleth both under one, and the same Commandement; And it is true, the lawfulnes of Worship may be marred by bad Circumstantiating of the worship, If one shall pray, when the Pastor doth preach; But Circumstances must be convenient, and so commanded, and so not indifferent, but Circumstances have no religious respect put on them by *God*, and therefore in that state have no roome in *Gods* worship,

V. 10. *If any man see thee, who hast knowledge, sit at meat in the Idols Temple, shall not the conscience of him that is weake, be emboldened, to eat these things that are offered to Idolls.* Hence a naked sight of that which is ordinarily exponed to be a Communion with an idoll, as kneeling religiously to bread is, must be a scandall. 2. The supposed knowledge of one, who saith, an Idoll is nothing, but directeth his worship to *God*, when externall gestures are used in an idolatrous way, doth not free the practise of such a worship, from scandall.

V. 11. 12. 13. Scandalizing in eating things, otherwise poore and cleane, is a scandalizing of a weake brother, against the price of *Christs* blood, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 10.

V. 16. 17. 18. Communion in Rites and Cerimonies of a false worship, is a communion with the Idoll, and Satan.

V. 22.

*V.*22. Though you keep your heart to *God*, ye provoke the *Lord* to jealousie.

*V.*23. Rulers are not to seeke their owne, in things indifferent.

*V.*25. *Things sacrificed to Idols*, yet in no religious state, are clean meates, and may be eaten. Surplice on a Noblemans porter is no *Masse habit*, and so not scandalous.

29. 30. In things indifferent, I must abstaine from using my libertie, where I am in danger to be evill spoken of, and that our liberty be called licentiousnesse.

Quest. II.

Whether or no the Ceremonies and things indifferent commanded by humane authority be objects scandalous, and what rules are to be observed in eschewing scandalls.

FOrmalists object, *That Ceremonies be not nocent agents in giving scandall, but men doe unjustly take scandall, whereas innocent Ceremonies give none.*

But observe that a scandall is given two wayes. 1. *Physically.* 2. *Morally. Physically*, when the object hath an influence meerely physicall in raising Scandall, in this meaning, as there be no passion, but it hath an action; so there is no scandall taken, but it is some way given. The Pharisees are scandalized at *Christs* preaching. The preached Word had some influence on their corruption to scandalize it, but physicall, not morall: but sinfull and inordinate actions, scandalize morally by contributing, a morall influence culpably to the scandalizing of others. Hence the question is, wherein standeth this morall and culpable influence.

An object scandalous two wayes.

The objects in Generall from whence commeth scandall be *foure*. 1. Things good. 2. Things sinfull and evill. 3. Things indifferent, inordinatly, or unseasonably done. 4. Things that have appearance of evill.

Some things may be scandalous objects.

A thing good of it selfe is not scandalous, but there be two *Good things*. 1. Some simply necessary, as *to love God*, not to steale, not to forsweare, these be never scandalous. 2. Some

good duties positive of affirmative precepts, as not necessarie, *hic & nunc*, may be omitted to eschew scandall. School-men move a question. If it be lawfull to omit workes commanded of *God*, or of the law of nature to eschew the scandall of our brethren? I answer, a naturall commandement to eschew the scandalizing of my brother, obliedgeth in some Circumstances, but not simply, for it obliedgeth not when there occurreth a Commandement naturall of greater obligation, whether it be naturall or positive, if I cannot decline the transgression of the law of *God*, in the declining of scandalizing my brother, Certainly the Commandement of not scandalizing doth not obliedge, for I am more obliedged to have a care of my owne salvation, then of my brothers, and so to prevent my owne sinnes, then the sinning of my brother: yet *Cæteris paribus*, if all other things be alike, as (a) *Becanus* saith. A naturall command, such as is, (not to scandalize) that is, (not to commit soule-murther) doth oblige more, then a positive Commandement, as to heare the Word *hic & nunc*: I am obliedged *hic & nunc*, to omit hearing of the Word to keep my brother from killing himselfe, and to preserve my brothers temporall life, because, *the Lord will have mercie, and not sacrifice*. Though I be not obliedged universally to omit the hearing of the Word, and receiving of the Sacraments, to eschew the scandall of my brother. 2. Sinnes publickly committed, are of their owne nature culpably scandalous.

(a) *Becanus p. 2. de Charit. c. 21. quæst. 5. nu. 5.*

3. In things indifferent, from whence ariseth a Scandall there be *two* things. 1. The use of the thing it selfe. 2. The use of it, with the non-necessitie of existence in it. As the causey stones are not scandalous, if any fall on them, nor the layer of the causey to be blamed therefore, because causay stones be necessarie, but if any lay an huge block in the way, which hath no necessary use there, he who doth so is the cause of the fall, because he contributeth to the fall, that which is the occasion, and so the cause of the fall, for every occasion is a certaine cause. 2. Because he contributeth such an occasion as hath no morall necessitie of existence, so the *brazen Serpent* having lost its vertue of curing and being adored as *God*, is formally a scandalous object, and the Prince suffering that to remaine, when it is

nor

not neceſſarie, and withall occaſioneth the idolatrie of many, doth culpably ſcandalize, and ſo theſe who for ſole will commandeth ſuch things as the worſhip of *God* may want, doe alſo ſcandalize. They object, *Chriſt might have healed on another day, then the* Lords. *Ergo, the non-morall neceſſitie maketh not the object formally ſcandalous, nor doth the contributer thereof culpably ſcandalize.*

Anſw. That *Chriſt* ſhould cure on the Sabbath, was morally neceſſary. 1. If it were but from his owne will, but mens will cannot make things neceſſary. 2. It was neceſſarie to ſhew, *that the Sonne of man was* Lord *of the Sabbath.* 3. That the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. 4. To ſhew, that workes of mercy are to be preferred to workes of Ceremonies, and that *God* loveth mercie, rather then Sacrifice,

When the dutie is onely poſſible, and the good leſſe neceſſary, then the good of non-ſcandalizing, then we are not, for hope of a poſſible dutie, and leſſe neceſſirie, to doe that from whence a Scandall doth ariſe. So it was not lawfull for *Paul* to take ſtipend, which ſhould have hindered the promoving of the Goſpell, though he might have imployed that ſtipend upon charitable uſes, becauſe that Charitie was a dutie onely poſſible, and incomparably leſſe neceſſarie, then the promoting of the Goſpell. So 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. Why ſuffer ye not rather loſſe? yet by that ſuffering loſſe, they were leſſe able for workes of Charitie, and to provide for their Familie and Children, but the gaine was temporall, and not to be compared with a good fame upon Chriſtian religion, which was ſlandered by heathen, when they went to law, Chriſtian againſt Chriſtian, before an Heathen Judge.

The fourth ſcandalous object, is that which hath appearance of evill. Not every thing is ſuch, for good hath the appearance of evill. (*b*) *Paybodie* to elude this, ſheweth a number of things which have appearance of evill, but are good, and he nameth among them, *Huſhaies abiding with Abſolon* in his conſpiracie, which was plaine diſſimulation, but that properly hath appearance of evill. 1. *Quod plærumq́, fit malo fine*, as the Schoolemen define it, that which ordinarily is done for an evill end, as

(*b*) *Paybodie of kneeling, par. 3. pag. 410.*

to ly in bed with another mans wife, to sit at the Idols table, to bow to an Image. 2. That which being good in it selfe, yet because of the circumstances is exponed vain-glory, as to pray in the streets, its ordinarily exponed to be for this end, to be seen of men. These who expone that place, 1 *Thess* 5. *Abstaine from all appearance of evill*, to be, *abstaine from that which seemeth evill to the conscience*, and judgement of the *doer*, or onely of doctrine reach not the *Apostles* minde: for to sit at the Idols table, to bow to an Image, and keepe the heart to God, are out of doubt appearances of evill forbidden in the text, yet are they not doctrines seeming evill alwayes, to the judgement of the practisers. *They object, to looke up to the heavens and Sunne, may have appearance of praying to the Sunne and heavens, for in the externall fact, no more could be done by a person adoring the Sun.* Ergo, *such appearances cannot be scandalous Objects. Answer*, lifting up of the eyes in prayer, are naturall adumbrations and expressions of the elevation of the heart, required in prayer, *Psal.* 25. *v.* 1. and so commonly exponed by all Nations, and therefore cannot be appearances of evill. Hence these rules.

Silvius in 22. q. 43 4 *Facere coram aliis id quod habet speciem mali, tunc solum est peccatum scandali, quando non subest causa legittima præsentibus manefestata. Satis notum erat quod Naaman non se flecteret pro cultu idoli, sed pro obsequio regis.*

Rules touching scandal.

I. *Suppose* all be strong, in whose presence I practise, a thing indifferent, yet if it have no necessitie, no aptitude to edifie, and have onely all its goodness from the will of commanders, in practising, I scandalize, 1. Because the strong are apt to sinne, and so apt to be scandalized, and the action is idle, and not reasonable, having no other reason, but the meere will of Rulers. 2. If I probably know my practice, shall come to the knowledge of these, who shall be scandalized, I scandalize them in such an action.

II. *Rule.* Though the practice of things indifferent, having some necessitie, be lawfull, as 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. *Eat what is set before you, asking no question for conscience sake.* Yet the faith and conscience of things indifferent, is never indifferent, we are never to judge a thing indifferent, necessarie, nor a thing necessarie, indifferent, and practice in that judgement, so erroneous is sinfull, and not of faith, *Rom.* 14 *v.* 22.

III *Rule.* An universall omission of good, of obeying affirmative precepts, for the eschewing of scandall, cannot be lawfull for it is 1. necessarie for my salvation to obey affirmative precepts;

cepts, though not in all differences of time. In this meaning (a) *Auguſtine* ſaid, *We are not to abſtaine from good workes,* (he meaneth a totall abſtainence) *for any ſcandall.* And *Tertullian* (b) *good offendeth non, ſave a wicked minde,* But at ſometime an obedience to an affirmative precept, *hic & nunc* may be omitted, when we ſee that from the doing thereof, the ignorant and weake will commit great ſinnes. So (c) *Aquinas,* (d) *Bannes,* (e) *Sanches, for affirmative precepts of the law of nature* (ſaith (f) *Bannes*) *muſt ſometime be omitted, for the eſchewing of ſcandall, for they doe not obliedge, but when, and after ſuch a manner, as is convenient.*

(a) Auguſt. Epiſt 199 *Non eſt ceſſandum ab operibus bonis, pro quocunq; ſcandalo.*

(b) Tertul. *Res bona neminem offendit, niſi malam mentem.*

(c) Aquinas *in* 22. *q.* 43. and (d) *Bannes* to. 3 in 22. q 43 art 8 c p 4 *Propter ſcandalum quod vel ex imbecillitate, vel ex ignorantia naſcitur, declinande omnes quantumcunq; rectæ actiones atq; utiles, & quæ ad animæ ſalutem non ſunt neceſſariæ, præter intendæ & occultandæ, aut ſaltem in aliud tempus differendæ.* (e) *Sanchez* in decal. l. 4 diſp 32. Dub 6 n 66. con 3 *Quando ex aliquo opere quantumvis bono, crederetur magna hominum multitudo, ex infirmitate aut ignorantia inducendi in gravia peccata, illud omittendum etiam cum jactura vitæ & bonorum ſpiritualium ad ſalutem non neceſſariorum* (f) Bannes to 3 22 q 43 art. 8 conclu. 2. *Præcepta affirmativa juris naturalis aliquando propter ſcandalum ſunt dimittenda -- quia præcepta affirmativa obligant, quando, & quomodo oportet.* (g) Antoninus 2 p. to. 1 cap 9 ſect ult. tit 3. cap 4 *Vereeus eſt peccati proximi qui abſq; ullâ juſtâ cauſâ non impedit ſcandalum, quod ex ſuo opere eſt futurum, quia videtur contemnere vitam ſpiritualem fratris* (h) Navarr. in ſum. cap 4. n 13. (k) Proverb 7. (l) N var. in ſum. cap 4. n 13 *Mortaliter peccat, qui ita parvi æſtimat ſalutem proximi, ut abſq; juſta neceſſitate, & utilitate, ex ſola ſua voluntate aliquid facit, unde frater eſt ſcandalizandus.* (m) Silveſter *in ſumma in verbo, obedientia, n 5. Si Papæ mandatum ſapiat etiam peccatum veniale Item ſi ex obedientia præſumeretur ſtatus eccleſiæ perturbandus, vel aliud malum aut ſcandalum futurum, etiamſi præciperetur ſub pœnâ Excommunicationis -- non eſt ei obediendum.* (o) Vaſquez tom. 4. in 3. q 43 art. 7 Dub 2.

V. Rule. To doe any good action, or lawfull, or indifferent, when I probably foreſee a ſcandall will follow, is an active ſcandall, for I preferre my owne will, to my brothers ſalvation (ſaith (g) *Antoninus*, and (h) *Navarret*,) and therefore ſaith (i) *Antoninus*; *A virgin going abroad, without juſt neceſſitie, where her beautie ſhall be a ſnare to young men, or to goe out upon a neceſſary cauſe with a whoriſh attire, is an active ſcandall, her feet abideth not in her houſe*, ſaith (k) *Solomon*. And (l) *Navarr*, ſaith, It is to ſinne mortally and (m) *Silveſter* ſaith, *If the Popes commandement doe but ſmell of veniall ſinne, and if by giving audience thereunto, it be preſumed that the ſtate of the Church ſhall be troubled, or a ſcandall ſhall ariſe, though the commandement goe out under the paine of Excommunication*, it is not to bee obeyed. (o) *Vaſques*, and

(p) Suarez de tripl. vir. Theolo. disp 10. De Scandalo. sect. 4 *Res indifferentes vendere, donare, aut alicui proponere, quando præscitur, alterum ijs male usurum, est scandalum committere.*

(q) Antoninus 2 p. to. 7. cap. 4. § 4.

(r) Silvester verbo scandalum q 2.

(ſ) Corduba sum. q. 5. fol. 30.

(t) Metina 12 cap. 74 art. 6. ad 3. fol. 677.

(u) Sanchez in Decal to 1. lib 1. cap. 6. nu. 16.

(p) *Suarez* say, *to sell, gift, or dispose of any things indifferent, when we foresee they shall abuse them, is to commit the sinne of active scandalizing.* Yea, the forme of an Idol, though he never adore it, doth highly scandalize, and (q) *Antoninus* (r) *Silvester*, (ſ) *Corduba*, (t) *Metina*, (u) the Jesuit *Zanches* teach, *That to contribute to that which we see, shall induce any to sinne, is to be guilty of scandalizing.* And the reasons be these; 1. *We are not to preferre our will to the salvation of our brother.* 2. *Things lesse necessarie, then our brothers salvation, in that case become not necessarie, and so fruitlesse and idle.* 3. *Charitie inferreth, that we hinder so far, as we can, the ruine of our brothers soul, Scandall is spirituall homicide.* 4. *To contribute any morall help, and influence to our brothers fall, and soul-ruine, is to be accessarie to his sinne.* Hence Ceremonies and things not necessarie to salvation, may be omitted altogether in their specialities, when the practising of them doth scandalize, and so though kneeling in *Gods* worship cannot well be universally omitted, yet kneeling appropriate to such an act of worship may be omitted, and ought to be omitted, if it scandalize, and Ceremonies which scandalize universally, seeing they are not in their very kinde necessarie to salvation, are to be abolished.

Yet I may adde one caution here. To contribute helpe for the doing of that, which of it selfe is necessarie, which I know, an other in respect of humane frailtie, will abuse to sinne is no active scandall. So to lay hands on a qualified Pastor is not sinne, though I foresee through humane frailtie, he will abuse his power in some things to sinne. So, for an Artificer to make swords, though he know some shall abuse them to murthering the innocent, is no scandalous work. I take not on me to prescribe rules for eschewing scandall in all occurrences of providence. The godly learned can see more then I can doe in this matter, where love should be warie to lay a straw in the way of any weake traveller.

Queſt. III.

Whether or no we may deny obedience to the lawes of our Superiours, for feare of Scandall cauſleſlie taken.

THis is not my queſtion, but a queſtion of the *Doctors* of *Aberdeen*, yet it conduceth for the times, and becauſe one of the learnedeſt of theſe Doctors did agitate the queſtion of ſcandall with me in private, before the writing of that book, I deſire libertie to vindicate my ſelfe, by diſcuſſing two chapters of this purpoſe.

And firſt the queſtion ſeemeth to me many wayes vaine. 1. They aske about denyall of obedience, which is not proved, but preſumed to be obedience. 2. They preſume that the Maſters, the Lord Prelates of Pearth faction are our Superiours, by nō law of *God*, or our *Church* was ever any ſuperioritie conferred upon them. 3. They ſay for ſcandall cauſleſly taken: if they meane that there be no juſt reaſon indeed why any ſhould take ſcandall, they ſay nothing againſt us, for we thinke to take ſcandall, is to ſinne, if they know any juſt reaſon or cauſe of ſinne, except Satan and mens free-will, we ſhall be taught of them. If they meane *ſcandalouſly taken*, that is, not culpably given by the practiſers of Ceremonies, this is a *Chimera*, and to us no queſtion, for we are not to denie obedience to lawfull lawes, for eſchewing Scandall, when obeyers doe give no cauſe culpably of Scandall, they would have formed the queſtion to our reverend and learned Brethren if they had dealt plainly. *Whether or no, we may deſiſt from practiſing Ceremonies, which, ſetting aſide the law of Superiours, are indifferent, when from the practiſing of them ariſeth the ruine of many ſoules, for whom Chriſt died.* In things neceſſarie commanded and forbidden of *God*, we cannot deny obedience, but the matter of the lawes is ſilenced in the queſtion to deceive the reader.

Duplyers.

Doctors of *Aberdeen.*

Duplyers.

If the ſcandall ariſing from *Pearth* Articles come, *ex conditione operis*, from the irregularitie of the fact, you ſay, *we ſhould forbeare them for ever*, yet this you gainſay in the next Chap. nu. 44. pag 67. *we ſay that the lawfull command of our Superiours may make that ſcandall of our weak brethren, not to be imputed to us, as a matter of our guiltineſſe*, which otherways would *be imputed to us as a matter of our guiltineſſe.* Now (I ſay) no ſcandall but that which is ſcandall *ex conditione operis*, from the enormitie o the practice can be imputed to us as guiltines or ſin, for paſſive ſcandall is unjuſtly imputed to us as ſin.

IF the Scandall ariſing from the Articles of Pearth come, ex conditione operis, *from the very enormitie in theſe Articles, then are we to forbeare theſe Articles ever. and not onely while they be tryed in a lawfull Aſſembly for ſuch are either ſinne, or have a manifeſt ſhow of ſinne. But if the ſcandall ariſe not from the Articles themſelves, but from maliſe or weakneſſe, we deny that we are totally to abſtaine from obedience to lawfull Superiours, for eſchewing Scandall cauſleſly taken, and we marvell from whence, ye have learned this ſtrange and harſh doctrine.*

Anſw. 1. Your enumeration is weake, for we know no Scandall juſtly taken, but proceeding from both theſe, weakneſſe or wickedneſs of nature, is the neereſt cauſe of all Scandall taken, becauſe it is the cauſe of all ſinne, and to be ſcandalized is ſinne. Alſo it is here taken from the enormitie of the deed, in that practiſing of things indifferent, if a ſcandall taken either weakly or malicioufly thence ariſe, there is enormitie in the deed; yet totall abſtinence is not hence concluded, becauſe, *ceſſante ratione ſcandali*, when the ground of the Scandall is removed, there is no enormitie in the fact. 2. You define to us, or rather divine, *that then there is an irregularitie in the fact that juſtly ſcandalizeth*, when either the fact is a ſinne, or then hath a manifeſt ſhew of ſinne. And we wonder where you learned this ſtrange Divinitie, for 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. To eat meat at a Feaſt that you are invited unto, is neither ſinne, becauſe *v.* 23. 25. it is lawfull: The earth is the Lords, nor is it ſuch as hath a manifeſt ſhew of ſinne, as all having ſenſe knoweth. One of your prime Doctors defined to me, theſe onely have manifeſt appearance of ſinne, *Quæ plerumq; fiunt malo fine*, which *for the moſt part are done for an evill end*, ſuch as is to lye in bed with another mans wife, to kneele before an Idoll. The former, in the expoſition of all is done for adulterie, the latter for Idolatrie. I am ſure to eat meats at an Infidels feaſt, is not of that nature *which is done ordinarily for an evill end*, it is ordinarily done to refreſh nature, and to ſolace it, which hath no manifeſt ſhew of ſinne, and yet if there be a weake one beſide, who ſaith, that meat is offered

to

to Idols, in that caſe to eat, *is to ſcandalize* 32. and is againſt the glory of *God*, *v.*31. 3. You aske from *whom we learned this ſtrange doctrine to deny obedience to the lawes of Superiours for ſcandall cauſleſly taken*; And we anſwer, we learned it from the Apoſtle *Paul*, who ſaith 1 *Cor.*8.13. *If meat offend my weake brother, I will eat no fleſh.* (I will abſtaine totally and abſolutely) *while the world ſtandeth.* This abſtinence for the date of the worlds ſtanding, *God* be thanked, is longer then the time to a lawfull *Generall Aſſembly* was at that time: yet the Apoſtle proveth, *Rom.*14. That to eat, or not to eat, was at that time as indifferent, as to practiſe, or not practiſe Ceremonies, alſo who ever offended at *Pauls* eating of fleſhes, were offended out of weakneſs, *v.*7. and it was in that ſenſe, ſcandall cauſleſly taken.

Duplyers pag.59. n.34.

The Author of the popiſh Engliſh Ceremonies, ſaith that both Cajetan *and* Bannes *affirm, that we ſhould abſtain a* ſpiritualibus non neceſſariis, *from ſpirituall duties not neceſſarie to ſalvation, when Scandall ariſeth from the doing of them, but none of the Schoolemen euer taught to abſtaine totally, and altogether from any ſpirituall dutie, for eſchewing the ſcandall of either weake, or wicked.* *Duplyers* Doct. *Aberdeen.*

Anſwer. What the author of the Engliſh Popiſh Ceremonies ſaith in that ſubject, all your learning ſhall never be able to Anſwer, for our brethren, required but abſtinence from theſe Ceremonies, till they be tryed in a lawfull Generall Aſſemblie, for they never were yet tryed in a lawfull Aſſemblie, till the late Aſſemblie at *Glaſgow*, *anno* 1638. 2. That Author argueth a *Majore*, and we deſire an Anſwer, if we may abſtaine from ſpirituall duties commanded by the moſt high Superiour the *Lord* our *God*. *hic & nunc* in caſe of Scandall. *Ergo*, farre more are we to abſtaine, from practiſing of dead Ceremonies voyd of all ſpirit of life, in the caſe of ſcandall, yea and univerſally, and totally we are to abſtaine, becauſe the Superiours have no power to make lawes *in materia ſcandaloſa*, when that which they command is ſcandalous; and in the very matter ſoule-murther.

Duplyers.

Thomas and his followers ſay, *Bona ſpiritualia non neceſſaria* Nu.35.

ſunt

sunt dimittenda propter scandalum, in ijs quæ sunt sub consilio, non vero sub præcepto, We may omit spirituall duties for eschewing scandall which fall under counsell, but not under commandement.

Answer. We conceive you not to be Papists, to hold this distinction, then farre more things indifferent for a time, in case of scandall may be forborne, when Counsells the performance whereof merit a greater degree of glorie in heaven, may be suspended. 2. It is false, for (*a*) *Aquinas* saith, *Actiones quantumcunq; rectæ at q; utiles omittendæ.* So (*b*) D. *Bannes.*

(*a*) *Aquinas* 22 q. 43.
(*b*) *Bannes* 16. ar. 8 ca. 4.
(*c*) *Aquinas* 16.
(*d*) *Aquinas* 22 q. 33. art. 1.
(*e*) *Navar.* in sum. cap. 4. nu 13.
(*f*) *Vasquez* 22. q. 43 art. 8 dub. 1. n 13.

Duplyers.

The most accurat Casuists and Interpreters of Thomas, *deny, that we can deny obedience to civill and Ecclesiasticall lawes, for eschewing scandall of the weake.* So Navarrus *in manuali cap* 19. *sect.* 44. Vasquez *to.* 5. *Tract. de Scandalo, dub.* 1. *sect.* 5. Becanus *to. post. part.* 2. *tract* 1. *cap* 27. *q.* 5. Ferdin. *de* Castro Palao *oper. moral. tract.* 6. *disp.* 6. *punct.* 16. *Duvall.* 22. *tract. de Charit. q.* 19. *art.* And they cite *Thomas, Durandus, Almain, Anton. Florent.*

Answer 1. (*c*) *Aquinas* saith, Excommunication may be omitted in the case of scandall. Now the Churches precept of Excommunication is no counsell, but a precept. And it is lawfull saith *Thomas to rebuke our brother, and an act of Mercy and Charitie commanded* (saith (*d*) he) *in the law of nature, and so not a Counsell.* Yet saith *Thomas, in case of scandall it may be omitted.* (*e*) *Navar.* doth contradict you, read when you please. And *Ferdinand. de Castro Palao*, you thought we had not these authors to find you out, and give to *Vasquez* (*f*) right play, *Wee may omit the hearing of a Masse which is no Counsell, but command to save the temperall life of our brother.* (*g*) *Becanus*, (*h*) *Duvallius* may be seen to crosse you.

Quoties cunq; scandalum passivum futurum est ex passione & ignorantia scandalizati opus utile temporaliter aut spiritualiter, quod nec est malum, nec habet speciem mali, nihil omnino est omittendum, aut differendum, donec cessat. scandalum.

(*g*) *Becanus* to. post. par. 2. c. 6. c. 27. *Ad vitandum scandalum alterius passivum ex infirmitate vel ignorantia tenemur omittere opus utile.* (*h*) *Duvallius* to. post. m 2 q 43. tract. de Charit. q. 19 art 5 *Potest aliquando contingere, ut quod ex se præceptum est, & consequenter necessarium est ad salutem, desinat in casum gravissimi scandali — Tyrannus usurpat bona Ecclesiæ, constat præceptum quantum fieri potest repetere, sed si minaretur populum abducere à fide, non obligat præceptum repetitionis.* And in that same place, *Opera quæ sunt indifferentia, id est, quæ in se, neq; bona neq; mala sunt, debent omitti quando conjicimus valde probabiliter ea futura esse in scandalum.* (*i*) *Bannes* 22. q. 43. art 7. *Cessandum à spiritualibus, quando quis ex ignorantia vel infirmitate scandalizatur.* (*k*) *Suarez* de Tripl. virt de Charit. disp. 10. de Scand. sect. 4 n 7. 8 *Prædicatio veritatis*

veritatis per accidens potest interdum habere rationem scandali activi, unde nonnunquam vitanda est, ut vitetur scandalum passivum (Pharisæorum) seu ruinæ proximi -- item præcepta positiva non obligant cum tanto rigore, at præceptum de procuranda vita spirituali proximi est naturale & divinum -- præcepta affirmativa non obligant ad semper. (l) *Gregor. de valent.* tom 3. disp 3. q.18. *de scandalo* hath the same. Adde to these *Augustine* lib 3. contra Parmenian. cap 2. *Gregor.* hom.7. in Ezechiel. And of School-men, *Albert* 4. distinct.17. art.48 *Durand.* 4. 38.q.3. *Angel.* in sum. verbo scandalum, n.5. *Cajetan.* tract.3. disp.7. sect.8. *Richard* 4 d.38. *Adrian.* quodlibet.1. art.3. *Pete.de Soto* lect.5. de confess. *Gabr.* 4. d.st 38 q 2. art.2. *Alphons.de Castro* lib.1. de justa punit. hæret. pa.1.26

Dupliers.

The School-men will us not to forbeare obedience, with a quite disclaiming of the authoritie of the Law, as you doe. Ans. Lawfull authoritie of Prelates lawes we know none. 2. Schoel-men say more, that the obligation of lawes doe cease in case of scandall.

Duplyers.

This kinde of forbearance for eschewing of scandall we improve. 1. *Arg. The author of English Popish Ceremonies*, part.1. cap.4. sect.4. *Not to obey the lawes of the Church in things whereof we are certainly perswaded they are not unlawfull and inexpedient, is a contempt and a scandall. But we are perswaded the things here, to wit, Articles of Pearth be neither unlawfull nor inexpedient.* Ergo, *The major is yours, the Assump. we prove by the light of our conscience.*

Answer. The author sayth so indeed, but withall he sayth, *that Church lawes bind not the conscience*, because they *are Church lawes, Sed propter rationem legum*, for the reason of the lawes; and such you cannot show to be in your Ceremonies. 2. The Assumption is badly proved, for your consciences are not transparent glasse, except that light come out in arguments founded upon the law and testimonie, and where this is not, there is no light, *Es.* 8.20. an erring conscience proveth nothing, so you beg the question.

Duplyers 2. *arg. n.37.*

That which may be removed by information and instruction, cannot be a warrand to us of a totall abstinence, from the obedience of the lawes. or which is all one, of an avowed disclaiming of the authoritie of them. But the scandall of the weake taken by Pearth Articles, may be removed by information, or instruction. Ergo.

I must crave here leave for a pause, and aske the question.

1. If information and light given to beware of the scandall of Ceremonies and things indifferent, can make them the lawfull object of *Church Canons, D. Forbes* and other say so. But 1. This is that which *Papists* say to our Divines, who object that Images are pits and snares to Idolatrie. This danger (saith *(a) Johannes de Lugo*) the Popes Professor at *Rome, is easily prevented by the instruction and care of Prelates, who are to teach, that Images have no dignitie of themselves, but onely from the samplar.* And so *(b) Bellarm.* the Jesuit, *(c) Vasquez. (d) Estius. (e) The Councell of Magountine* helpeth the matter. *Let our Pastours* (say they) *carefully teach the people, that Images are not set up, that we should adore them, but that they should be helps for our memorie.* 2. *Paul* gave strong reasons for lawfulnesse of dayes, and meats, that weake Jewes should not be scandalized at the eating thereof. yet he would neither passe them in a *Church Canon*, nor practise them himselfe, *while the world standeth*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. yea, he proveth *Rom.* 14. by eight strong Arguments, that it was not lawfull to practise them. *Ergo*, he presupposeth that information of Pastours should not take away the scandall of the weake, as *Rom.* 14. 14. There is nothing uncleane of it selfe. *Ergo*, It is lawfull to eat all meats, 1 *Cor.* 10. 26. *The earth is the Lords. Ergo*, eat what is set before you, *v.* 23. *all things are lawfull*, and yet he saith, *eat not, give no offence, if meat offend my brother, I will not eat to the worlds end.* 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. 3. This vaine argument presupposeth that the want of literall information, is the adequat cause of falling in scandall, a vaine reason. *Peter* actively and culpably scandalized *Christ* in his carnall counsell, *Master, pitty thy selfe, Mat.* 16 21. 22. 23. yet *Christ* was sufficiently inlightened, that he could not be scandalized. But certaine it is, that the will and depraved inclination is the cause why we fall in scandall, even when we know that others who publickly sinneth, doth sinne, and that we should not be scandalized. Now no reason in Pastors preaching, or in *Church-Canon*, can take away the inclina-

D. *Forbes. Iren.*

(a) *Ioannes de Lugo de myst. incarn. disp* 36 sect 1. n 3. *Hoc periculum facile præcavetur doctrina & cura Prælatorum, qui docent frequenter imagines non habere in se, nec propter se aliquam dignitatem, nisi quam accipiant ab exemplari.*

(b) *Bellarm.* l. 2. de rel. sanct. c 4. ad 2 *Nec desunt in Ecclesia qui doceant literis, & sermonibus, quis cultus reliquiis (formulisque elementis sacramentalibus) debeatur.*

(c) *Vasquez* in 3 part. to. 1. disp 105. c. 5. n. 3. *Quare nec aliquid periculi in ipsarum (imaginum) adoratione, si populus rudis, juxta sinceram fidem & religionem, mediocriter instituatur.* (d) *Estius*, lib. 3 dist. 36. sect 7. *Ecclesia diligenter & doctrina, & opere distinguit inter honorem Deo proprium, & eum qui Divinis ac Dei amicis hominibus tribuitur.* (e) *Concil Moguntinum*, cap. 41. *Pastores nostri populum accuratè moneant, imagines non ad id proponi, ut eas adoremus — Sed ut per imagines recordemur.*

tion of the heart to evill, and therefore no information of Pastors can remove the scandall of the weake; For then *David* in committing adulterie, *Noah* in drunkennes, *Lot* in his incestuous folly with his owne daughters, *Peter* in denying his Saviour, should not have caused others within, or without the *Church* to stumble, nor have culpably scandalized them; So *David. Noah, Lot,* and *Peter,* had preached to all that heard of their fall, that adulterie, drunkennes, incest, and denyall of *Christ,* were grievous sinnes to be avoyded, and that it was sin for any to be scandalized thereat, for such information should have given sufficient literall information to beware of the like sinnes. Yea, a father might inclose in a chamber, his sonne and a beautifull virgin, and if he should sufficiently informe his son of the guiltines, and punishment of harlotrie, he should not lay a stumbling-block before his sonne. Yet we all know, a stumbling-block may be layed before the inclination no lesse, then before the blind minde, yea suppose, to warne a Traveller of a pit, in his way, might be sufficient, to make the digger of the pit free of laying a stumbling-block in the way (as it is not) seeing to make a pit is not indifferent; yet it shall not free the Commanders of Ceremonies and the acts of *Pearth* Assemblie of active scandall, because men naturally loving life and health, hate to fall into pitts, which may indanger their life, and so have no inward morall inclination to fall into a pitt; but men though informed of spirituall falls, and warned to beware of them, yet love and incline to Idolatrie, and therefore to warne them to beware, and yet set the powder neere the fire, is but to scorne the craft, and to mock men. Yea, in that they desire and require, that the people beware of the Ceremonies, and require that Pastours informe them of the danger; they grant that Ceremonies are powder amongst the pitchers, and yet they be innocent, and indifferent creatures, as if they would call them indifferent pitts, indifferent whoores to allure, beware of them; indifferent pest-cloathes, see that your inclination touch them not. Yea, then *Ezechiah* had given no scandall, if he had commanded the brazen Serpent still to stand, and had commanded the Priests to preach that the Serpent was not *God,* and therefore warned the people of their Idolatrie in burning Incence to

it, onely let it ſtand as a memoriall of *Gods* power in curing the people, who were ſtinged with Serpents in the Wilderneſſe. So if the *Iſraelites* ſhould give their ſonnes and daughters *to marry ſtrange women of the Canaanites*, if they ſhould ordaine the Prieſts to teach carefully their married children, to beware, that they were not drawne away, by theſe idolatrous marriages, to ſerve the *Gods of the Canaanites*, they ſhould not lay a ſtumbling-block before their ſonnes and daughters. Yea, theſe who excell in light, may be weake in grace, and in hazard to be inſnared, by the idolatrie and ſuperſtition of Ceremonies.

4. The law of nature provideth all poſſible and lawfull meanes for the removall of every thing, that may ruine *his ſoule, for whom Chriſt died*, but not onely information of the danger of Ceremonies, but alſo the removall of the pitts themſelves, to wit, the Ceremonies are poſſible and lawfull meanes.

5. 1. This were an idle Sabbath work, to expound ſuch theams as theſe *Sacramentall bowing is an humble adoring of* God, *not of bread*, (*and as it pleaſed* God *by the fooliſhneſs of preaching to ſave beleevers, ſo it pleaſed Prelates, by the fooliſhnes of holy dayes and Saints dayes, to teach the people articles of faith, and by the Surplice to teach paſtorall innocencie, and by confirmation to bleſſe children.*) 2 (*c*) *Calvin*, and (*d*) *Luther* teach, *that no word ſhould be heard in the Church*, niſi purum Dei verbum, *but the pure word of* God. *Surplice humane and Saints dayes, croſſing, kneeling*, cannot be a text that Miniſters can preach on, and expound, for they are commanded to ſpeak *Gods* word, *Ezech.* 7. *To read* Gods *law, and give the meaning and ſenſe thereof*, Nehem. 8, 8. and to expone the Scriptures, *Luk.* 24. 27. not to teach the meaning of wretched Ceremonies, for in that they ſhould not be the Paſtours of *Chriſt*, but ſpeak with the mouth of *Antichriſt*, an. *Exod.* 12. 26, 27. If the children ask the fathers, *what mean yee by this Paſſeover*, they were to anſwer, *It is the Sacrifice of the Lords Paſſeover.* So if they ask what meaneth your kneeling to Bread, your Saints dayes, your Surplice and Croſſing, you muſt anſwer, *they are the Ceremonies of the Lords Supper, and Baptiſme*; What uncouth bleating were this? 6. *Shall people* (ſaith D. *Ammes* (e) *be fedde with this Eaſt wind, the vertue of Surplice, when there be ſo little time, to learne the maine things*

(*c*) *Calvin. Inſtit.* l. 4. c. 8. ſect. 8.

(*d*) *Luther com in Gal* 1. *neque alia doctrina in Eccleſia tradi, aut audiri debet, quam puram dei verbum.*

(*e*) *D. Ammes fleſh fuit.*

things of the Gospell? also some preach none, some studie never Ceremonies, some blush to speake of such toyes. Yea *and also often saith,* (*f*) *Bannes* the *weake are not capable of distinctions,* it is hard to draw the wits of rude people along the untwisted threed of distinctions, that the elements are *objectum adorationis à quo significative* and *objectum adorationis relativæ materiale, non adorationis formale.* I conceive the Doctors of *Aberdeen* have adoe with their wits to understand them, they must be taught of *D. Mortounes* essentiall and accidentall worship; of *Bellarmines* additions perfecting, and additions corrupting the word of *God.* And whereas *D. Forbes* saith; *It is a shame for Ministers, and teachers of others to pretend weaknes, though the flock might be ignorant. Answer.* Weakness, is weakness of faith, *Rom.* 14. 1. and weaknesse of grace, not weakness in literall light. And I thinke Ministers may pretend this upon too good grounds, and weaknes of faith is often a great inclination to superstition. 2. Though the Ministers refusing the Ceremonies, should understand them as well as these who writ bookes for their defence, yet it will not follow that they should practise them, for their forbearance is for feare of scandalizing the weak. *Paul* had perfect knowledge of his Christian libertie, as any man, *yet he would not eat meats to the worlds end, which should offend his brother.* The stronger should not scandalize the weak, because they are stronger.

(*f*) *Bannes*, tom. 3. in 2. q. 43 art. 8. *Nota posse contingere ut pusilli non sint capaces rationis reddita, & tunc quamvis sit reddita illis ratio tamen ab hujusmodi spiritualibus cessandum, quia tunc non ex malicia, sed ex ignorantia scandalizantur*, c. 4 sect. 1. q. 10.

Duplyers pag. 63. n. 38.

Thirdly, if for Scandalls taken, especially by the malicious, we may disclaime the authority of a Law, then we may ever disclaime the authoritie of all lawes of Church *and State, for there is nothing commanded by lawes, but some, either through weaknes, or through malice, may take offence at it.*

Answer. 1. For scandalls taken, and also given, by either weak, or wilfull, when the matter is indifferent, and hath evident conformitie with *Jewish* and *Popish* rites, and is not necessarie, we may disclaim the authoritie of all such lawes, true. *Ergo*, we may for scandall maliciously taken, deny the authority of all lawes, it followeth not. *Ex affirmatione speciei male colligitur negatio generis.* It is not for taken scandall, but for given scandall.

dall, that we disclaime the authoritie of these lawes. 2. *The Doctors will have us believe, upon the sole light of their conscience,* n. 36. *that they thinke the Ceremonies lawfull and expedient.* But for us, they will not credit us in that, but out of malice we are scandalized, and not out of weakneſſe.

Duplyers *n.* 39. 4. *arg.*

Fourthly, We ought not for eschewing scandall causlesly taken, to injure or offend any man, by denying to him, that which is due to him, and therefore we ought not, for eschewing scandall causlesly taken to offend and injure our Superiours. The Antecedent is proved, for if a man be excommunicated, shall his wife, children and servants flie his company, and so deny these duties which they owe to him, for feare that others be scandalized? and if we may not for scandall causlesly taken abstaine from these duties, that we owe to private persons farre lesse may we abstaine from obedience, which we owe to Superiours, &c.

Answer. Against the Law of disputing, you lay downe a ground, which is a principall part of the question that is practising these Ceremonies be obedience due to Superiours, and none practising for a time an injuring of Superiours in their due, though *Gods* affirmative precepts be omitted for a time, as the not hearing the Word, the not receiving the Sacraments, in case of Scandall, *Gods* due is not taken from him. If you will be more zealous for the honour of Prelates and men, then for the honour of *God*. Answer the Argument your selfe: I am not to reprove a scorner because of the scandall, he shall but trample, as a sow, upon any word of reproofe, yet the scandall were causlesly taken if we should doe so, The good word of *God* should furnish no just cause to him, yet am I not taking from *God* his due, and your bare word, that this is disobedience to Superiours, not to practise *Pearth* Ceremonies is not enough to us. 2. Your probation is weak, That children and wife keep company with the Excommunicate father, is a commandement of the law of nature, and *Gods* necessary law, and to deny this to an husband and father is such a sinne, as the eschewing of a scandall can never legitimate, but I hope kneeling to Bread, and Crossing, and Surplice (commanded in our *Canons* and *Service-book*) are at

the

the best commanded by a positive law, and not commanded in the law of nature, and so very unlike to naturall duties that wife and children owe to father and husband. 3. I retort this Argument. We may not wrong men in that which is their due. *Ergo*, We may not wrong *God* in his due, but it is his due; (*Murther not him for whom* Christ *died, practise not Ceremonies before the weake who shall be scandalized thereat.*)

Duplyers 5. arg. n. 40.

What if the thing be commanded by the Civill Magistrate under paine of death, and by Ecclesiasticall authoritie under paine of Excommunication, shall we for feare of scandall causlesly taken, which may be removed by information, or for the scandall of the malitious, abstaine from a thing lawfull and expedient injoyned by authoritie, and incurre these grievous punishments of death, temporall and spirituall? We believe your selves, who speake most of scandall, would be loath to take such a yoake upon you.

Answer. The first part of this Argument is Logick from a sore skinne; That which we are bidden doe under paine of death, that we must doe, the just logick of the King of *Babylon*, to prove it is lawfull to worship *the Kings golden Image*, Dan. 3. 15. I have scarce heard *Papists* for shame presse to conclude the equity and lawfulnesse of a Law, from the penaltie of a law, Suffering (as your *Jesuits* and *Arminians* teach you) falleth not under Free-will, and is not culpably evill, nor is Excommunication except you be *Papists*, death of the soule, when the cause of Excommunication is not just, and deserveth no censure, but it may be some of you think (Mr. *Sibbald* I know doth it) that *Navarrus*, and their *Gregorie* said true, *that unjust Excommunication is valid, and to be feared*: but if this argument (as I see not head nor feet in it) be founded upon the lawfulnesse and expediencie of Ceremonies commanded, then not to practise them at all. So first they be lawfull. 2 Expedient. 3. Commanded by lawfull authority, is sinne, and all sinne is a death of the soule, and then you may put your Argument from grievous punishments of body and soule in your pocket, for it is of no use here, for whether punishment Civill or Ecclesiastick follow upon disobedience to Superiours, it *is* sinne. 3. That none of us

would die or be Excommunicated for eschewing Scandall, is no good argument, though many have suffered as hard as death, banishment, and proscription of all, and Excommunication also. But the truth is, you might have said; Shall we incurre for scandall the losse of our stipends, and (one faire before the wind, qualification) for a Bishoprick?

Duplyers 6.arg. pag.64. n.41.

Sixtly, The denying of obedience to the lawfull commandements of our Superiours is forbidden in the fift commandement, and consequently it is sinne: shall we then for a scandall causlesly taken, deny obedience to our Superiours, and so incurre the guiltinesse of sinne? Ye commonly answer to this, that the negative part of the fift Commandement, which forbiddeth the resisting of the power, Rom. 13. 2. *is to be understood with the exception of the case of any scandall taken by others. For if we say (say ye) that any may, or will take offence, at the doing of that which is commanded by our Superiours, we are not holden to obey them 42. But first, we aske, what warrant ye have to say, that the negative part of the fift Commandement is to be understood with the exception of the case of Scandall, more then other negative precepts in the second Table?*

Answer 1. To fill the field, an Argument already answered, is brought again to make the figure of six up; The refusall of the Ceremonies till they be tryed in a lawfull Assembly, is not forbidden in the fift Commandement, prove that, and take it with you. 2. You bring an Answer as *commonly given by us*, that is neither ours, commonly, nor rarely, but it is good, build a straw-castle, and you may soone cast a fire-ball at it, and blow it up. We never taught that the negative part of the fift Commandement is to be understood with the exception of the *case of any scandall taken by others*. For this includeth all scandalls, both passive and active. Who of ours ever dreamed such a thing, if Superiours command, what *God* commandeth before them, doe we teach that, because others take scandall at that Command, therefore we are not holden to obey? that is scandall taken, not given. We teach no such thing. Rulers command to honour father and mother, if any take offence at this commandement

and

and obedience to either the affirmative or negative part of it, we are not to esteeme that scandall the weight of a feather, the Commandement obliedgeth. But this we teach, if when the matter of the Commandement of Rulers is indifferent, as you plead Ceremonies to be, if from obeying of these any weake or wicked be scandalized, then the Rulers doe command spirituall murther, and then their commandement is no commandement, nor is it the fift Commandement. It is just like this, *You shall not refuse obedience to your Rulers, commanding you to rubbe your beards when you come to the Church, or to draw a crosse line with your thumbe in the aire above a baptized infants forehead, though many soules, by obedience to these Commandements, be induced to love Poperie; many be made sad, thinking zealous Rulers, love popish toyes better then the simplicitie of the Gospell.* Now such is the Commandements of *Pearth-articles*, and these suffer no exceptions, for we judge them no Commandements at all, and if any such be injoyned upon pretence of any other of the nine Commandements, we hold them to be impious commandements, and no obedience to be given to them at all. So if according to the sixt Commandement, and the seven and eight, Rulers command to run Carts amongst a multitude of young Children, whence killing of some might fall out; If they should command a young man, and a faire virgin to chamber together, and command *Paul* in the case he was at *Corinth* to take stipend, though it should hinder the progresse of the Gospell, as 1 *Cor.* 9.23. all these were to command culpable scandalls, and were unlawfull, as the *Canons of Pearth faction.*

3. You say, the negative part of the fift Commandement forbidding the resisting of the power, *Rom.* 13.2. by us, is to be understood, with exception of the case of scandall taken, whereby you insinuate, that not to obey the acts of *Pearth* Assembly, *is a resisting of the power of Rulers*, Rom. 13.2. It is ignorantly spoken, to resist every law of the Rulers, is not to resist his power, when the lawes are such as commandeth scandall: yea, by your own doctrine it is lawfull to flie when a Ruler unjustly, commandeth & persueth his subjects, *pag.* 3. *n.* 19. And to flie I am sure, is to refuse subjection to the Lawes of the Ruler, from whose tribunall we flie, yea, and to flie so, is to resist his lawes,

but I hope it is not to resist the power, for to resist the power, bringeth damnation, and guiltinesse before *God*, Rom. 13. 2. But to flie from his legall Citations, is to resist his lawes, but doth not, I hope, bring damnation before *God*, and sinne upon the conscience, as you grant.

Duplyers n. 43.

Men are ready to stumble, and to be scandalized at our refusing obedience to the lawfull Commandements of our Superiours: for they will take occasion by our cariage, to doe that, unto which by nature they be most inclined, to wit, to vilipend Lawes and Authoritie.

Answer. If any stumble at our non-obedience to *Pearth Articles*, and thence be induced to vilipend Lawes and Authoritie, it is a scandall meerely taken, no wayes given, as is cleare, because they stumble at our obedience to *God, in that we refuse to kill one for whom Christ died.* 2. It is no wayes true, that men are naturally inclined to vilipend Laws in a matter indifferent, (as you hold Ceremonies to be) from whence ariseth Scandall, yea, we are by nature much bent to extoll and love lawes commanding soul-murther, and all lawes inductive to Poperie, which is but a masse of carnall propositions of heterodox Divinitie, every way sutable to our flesh. The third exception is answered already, the fourth is to be discussed in the following Chapter.

Quest. IIII.

Whether the Precept of obedience to Superiours, or the precept of eschewing scandall be more obligatorie?

Dupliers pag. 65. n. 43.

First of all, when a man is peremptorily urged by his Superiours, to obey their lawfull Commandements, and in the meane time feareth that if he doe the thing commanded by them, some, through weakneſſe, shall be scandalized, by his carriage; in this case he is not onely in difficultie and strait, betwixt the Commandement of men, and the Commandements

dement of God, *who forbiddeth us to doe that whereby our weake brother may be offended. But also he seemeth to be in a strait betwixt two Commandements of* God, *to wit, the precept that forbiddeth us to doe that, whereby our weake brother may be scandalized, and the other, which forbiddeth, the resisting of Authoritie.*

Answer. 1. The question of purpose is perversly set doune, for they should say, whether the precept of obedience to Superiours, in a straw lifting, in things indifferent, and meerely positive, and not necessarie to salvation, be more obligatorie, then the precept of *God*, in the law of nature, in a matter necessarie to salvation, as a Commandement of *God* forbidding soul-murther, and *scandalizing him for whom Christ died?* Or thus; Whether am I obliedged rather to obey *God*, forbidding me to murther my brother, or to obey man, commanding me to kneele towards Bread and Wine, and to crosse the aire with my thumbe upon the face of a baptized infant.

2. The question seemeth to make a collision of Commandements, as if *God* could command things contradictorie, and certainly, if the not obeying of *Pearth Articles* be a scandall given, as you say, it is, I shall undertake to prove, that the practice of these Ceremonies is a Scandall given, and so it is not a seeming strait as you say, but a reall strait by your doctrine. There be cases wherein, whether Rulers command things, or command the contrary, a passive scandall doth arise, but because a passive Scandall, is the sinne of the scandall taker, and not of Rulers giving, the *Church* is not to regard it, as *Matth.* 11. 18, 19. The Jewes are scandalized, at *Christs* eating and drinking, and are scandalized at *John* the *Baptists* not eating and drinking. But neither *Christ*, nor *John* doe culpably give scandall. But there can be no such exigence of providence wherein non-practising of your commanded Ceremonies, is a given scandall, and the practising of them is also a given scandall. Because (as (*a*) *Bannes*, and our owne (*b*) *Amesius* saith, *There is not such a perplexitie.* 1. *God* should have brought a man then in some cases under an absolute necessitie, by way of contradiction to sinne, and murther his brother, whether he doe such a thing, or not doe it. 2. Twentie *Jewes* are scandalized, *Rom.* 14. Because *Paul* eateth such and such meats, which they conceive are forbidden

Tannern. to 3. in 22. dis. 2. q. 6 dub. 9. *concurrentibus duobus præceptis quorum utrum. que servari non potest, obligare desinit alterum quid vim obligandi minorem habet.* Ita Suarez. to. 3. d. s. 66. sect. 4. Gregor. de Valentia in. 22. q. 18. punct. 4

(*a*) *D. Bannes* to. 3. in 22. q. 43. art. 8. con. 3. *Talis perplexitas est absurdum quid.*

(*b*) *Amesius* de Conf. lib. 5. cap. 11 thes. 18 *Nulla datur talis perplexitas, &c.*

bidden by *Gods* law. And twentie Christians are scandalized, because *Paul* eateth not such and such meats, then we suppose, and its very casuall, for seeing, to be scandalized ariseth from the knowledge or ignorance of the minde, and divers men may have contrary opinions about one thing. Some thinke it unlawfull for *Paul* to eat, some thinke it unlawfull not to eat. Hence upon the use of a thing indifferent, twentie are scandalized, and upon the non-using of that same indifferent thing, twentie are also scandalized. What shall *Paul* doe in this strait. I answer, he taketh *Rom.* 14. 1 *Cor.* 8. the negative. *I will not eat flesh, if meat offend my brother.* Then the twentie that are scandalized by the non-practice of the thing indifferent, doe take scandall onely, whereas *Paul* giveth no scandall actively. Also, the othet twentie who are scandalized by *Paul* his practice of the thing indifferent, are justly scandalized, & it is both a scandall taken, and active, and a scandall given and passive. Some object, but if either of the sides be indifferent, to wit, either to use a thing indifferent, or not to use it. If ten take offence at the use of it, and ten take offence at the non-use of it, there is a necessitie of scandalizing either of the sides, for the twentie weake Christians are scandalized at *Pauls* abstinence from such meats, conceiving that he Judaizeth, whereas the Profession of his Christian libertie in eating would edifie them, and not scandalize them.

Answer. The use of a thing indifferent is not *Gods* lawfull mean of edification, *God* hath appointed his Word, Workes, the holy and blameless profession of his children to edifie, and not the using of actions indifferent, yea, actions indifferent as they are such, and separated from necessitie, and morall reason, are not lawfull, and so the cessation from that action is lawfull and necessarie, and if the use scandalize, non-using of things indifferent, is not indifferent, but necessarie, as non-scandalizing and negative precepts alwayes binding, abstinence, with *Paul* is necessarie. It is vaine that *Paybodie* saith, that *Peter was Gal.* 2. *in danger of a double scandall, for (saith he) he was in danger to scandalize the* Gentiles, *in refusing their companie as if they had been no brethren, which was the greater scandall, and in danger to scandalize the Jewes in eating with the* Gentiles, *which was a lesse*

ſinne, and leſſe ſcandall. But I anſwer, *Paul* did not then juſtly rebuke his Judaizing, *Galat.*2. which doth gratifie *Barronius*, *Bellarmine*, and *Papiſts*, who will have *Peter*, an Apoſtle who could not erre. 2. It ſhould follow that *Paul* rebuked *Peter*, becauſe that of two evills of ſinne, he chooſed to commit the leſſer ſinne. Whereas of two evills of ſinne, neither is to be choſen. One might then lawfully commit fornication to be free of adulterie, and ſo fornication ſhould be lawfull, which is abſurd. And *Paul* ſhould call *Gal.*2.14. it upright walking according to the truth of the Goſpell to chooſe a leſſe ſin. 3. *Peter* by eating with the *Gentiles*, ſhould not have ſcandalized the *Jewes*, but edified them, in ſhewing the Chriſtian libertie they had in *Chriſt*, as is cleare, *v.*5. *To whom we gave no ſubjection, no not for an houre* (by practiſing Jewiſh Ceremonies) *that the truth of the Goſpell might continue with you.*

Duplyers pag.66.

It is certaine we are freed from one of theſe precepts, for Gods *precepts are not repugnant one to another. Ye commonly ſay, the precept of obedience to humane authoritie, muſt give place to the precept of eſchewing Scandall, though it be cauſleſly taken, becauſe the command of a Superiour cannot make that fact to be free of ſcandall, which otherwiſe would be ſcandalous. But it is certaine, that (laying aſide the caſe of ſcandall) to denie obedience to the ordinance of our Superiours, injoyning and peremptorily requiring of us, things lawfull and expedient, is really the ſinne of diſobedience. Ye will ſay, that the ſcandall of weake brethren, may make that fact or omiſſion, not to be diſobedience, which otherwiſe would be diſobedience; becauſe we ought not for the Commandement of man, doe that whereby our weake brother may be offended: and ſo the precept of obedience bindeth not, when offence of a weake brother may be feared. On the contrary we ſay, that the lawfull commandement of Superiours, may make that ſcandall of our weake brethren, not to be imputed unto us, which otherwiſe would bee imputed unto us, as a matter of our guiltineſſe. No ſcandall of weake brethren cauſleſly taken, can make that fact, not to be the ſinne of diſobedience, which otherwayes, that is* extra caſum ſcandali, *if it were not in the*

caſe

case of scandall, would bee the sinne of disobedience.

Answer. 1. This is right downe worke. But 1. I Answer, Both the precepts are not obligatorie, you say true. *We commonly say* (saith the Doctors) *that the precept of obedience to humane authoritie, must give place to the precept of eschewing scandall, although it be causlesly taken.* We say not that *Commonly*, nor at all, if by Scandall causlesly taken, you mean scandall passive, onely taken, and not given, for we are not to regard such scandalls. But here the scandall is given in that, we must practise base Ceremonies, indifferent knots of straws for mens pleasure, though from thence many soules *for whom* Christ *died*, be destroyed. 2. It is good reason *that the precept of obedience to humane authoritie* in things which you call indifferent, and might well be sent away to *Rome* (were it not the Lord Prelates pleasure to command them, for their owne carnall ends) should yeild and be gone, and lose all obligatorie power, because it is but a positive precept, and 2. affirmative, that obliedgeth not *ad semper*, as *Crosse, kneele, weare Surplice.* And 3. In a thing indifferent, and that this Divine Commandement of *God*, (*scandalize not*) (*kill not one redeemed by* Christ) should stand in force. 1. Because it is a naturall precept. 2. It is negative, and obliedgeth eternally. 3. It is of a necessarie matter, because no *man-slayer hath life eternall*, 1 *Jh.* 3. 15. But our Doctors will have the Commandements positive of men to stand, and the Commandements of *God*, which are expresly of the law of nature to fall before their *Dagon*, and to lose all obligatorie power, whereas *Gods* owne positive law yeildeth, and loseth obligatorie power, when *Gods* naturall Commandement of mercy commeth in competition with it, as is cleare as the noon-day, in *David* famishing, who eat the *Shew-bread*, which by a positive law, *was not lawfull to any save the Priests onely, to eat*, yet must mans law stand, and *Gods* law of nature fall, at the pleasure of these Doctors. 3. Wee say justly, you erre in saying it is *reall disobedience to deny obedience to the ordinance of Superiours*, when the matter of their law is indifferent, and when it is scandalous, and obedience cannot be given to it, *but by slaying him for whom Christ died*, yea, to give obedience to Superiours in that case, is reall murthering of soules, and reall disobedience to

God.

God. Yea, and if there be murthering of a weake brother in the fact, it cannot come under the compasse of the matter of an humane law, and the Scandall maketh it no obedience to men, but disobedience to *God.* 4. You retort bravely, but Popishly, the argument back upon us; But we bring our argument from the law of Nature (*Thou shalt not murther, nor scandalize*) and we bring it not so much against the obedience to the Commandement of Superiours, as against the law and Commandement of Superiours, and this Argument is against the Ceremonies, as if they had not been commanded, and as they were before the Assembly of *Pearth*, and therefore the consideration of a lawfull Commandement to take away the scandall, is not to any purpose. And so 5. I may invite *Papists, Jesuites*, and all the Patrons of the *Pope*, to thanke you, and kisse your pen, for these words *we say that the lawfull Commandement of Superiours* (of Prelates commanding things indifferent) *may make that scandall of our weake brethren not to be imputed unto us, which otherwise would be imputed unto us, as a matter of our guiltinesse.* What ever (my brethren) may be imputed to you otherwise, & before the law of *Pearth Assemblie* was made, as the *matter of your guiltinesse*, was your sinne, for nothing can be imputed to Men or Angels, as *guiltinesse*, but sin. But if the Commandements of Prelates may make that not to be imputed to you, which *otherwise* and before, or without that law of Superiours, would have been imputed as the matter of your guiltinesse, then the law of Superiours and Prelates may make that, which without that law, would have been sinne, to be no sinne at all. I know no more said by (*c*) *Bellarmine* of the Universall Prelate of the world, but that he *can make sin to be no sinne, and no sinne to be sinne.* And (*d*) *that the Pope cannot command vertue as vice, and vice as vertue, for if he should doe so, the Church should be obliged to believe vertue to be vice, and vice to be vertue.* But much good doe it you, Masters of Arts. Yet *Bellarmine* in his recognitions, saith not so much of his great Pope-Prelate, as you say of your little *Prelates*, for (*e*) he will not give the foresaid power to the *Pope*, but in doubt-

(*c*) *Bellarm.* contra *Barcla.* cap. 31. *In bono sensu Christus dedit Petro (Papæ) potestatem faciendi de peccato non peccatum, & de non peccato peccatum.*

(*d*) *Bellar. de Romano Pontif.* l. 4. cap. 5.

(*e*) *Bellarm.* in Recognit. onibus. *Loquuti sumus de actibus dubiis virtuum & vitiorum, nam si percipe-ret manifestum vitium, aut probiberet manifestam virtutem dicendum esset cum Petro,* Act. 5. *Obedire oportet magis Deo, quam hominibus —— dicimus posse jubere ut tali die non jejunetur,-- non potest autem jubere ut non colatur Deus.*

some acts, and in acts of positive lawes about fasting, you give to Prelates more, to wit, *that their commanding will, may make sinnes forbidden in the law of nature, to be not imputed, as the matter of our guiltinesse, and to be no sinnes*; We cannot want dispensations and indulgences at home, ere it be long, if happily we pay well for them.

Yet (*f*) *Bernard* will not have the *Popes* commandement to make that which is simply evill to be lawfull. (*g*) *The Popes pleasure make not things good* (saith *Tolet*) yea, *a subject* (saith (*h*) *Alphonsus de Castro*) *may without sinne contemne the law of his Superiour, judging it to be evill, and contrary to reason.*

But I reason thus; It is the incommunicable power of the Supreame Law-giver to make the killing of *Isaac*, which otherwayes would have been *imputed to* Abraham *as a matter of guiltinesse*, and crueltie, to be no sinne. *Ergo*, Prelates have not power to make an act of soul-murther, to be no sinne, to scandalize a weake brother is to destroy him, for whom *Christ* died, *Rom.*14.*v.*15. 1 *Cor.*8.*v.*11. yea, and by the same law Rulers may make an act of Adulterie, an act of Chastitie, an act of lying, an act of truth speaking.

2. If Rulers, even the *Apostle Paul*, be tyed by the law of Nature, to Charitie to their brethren, as *Rom.*14.15. *Not to slay him for whom Christ died, not to seeke their owne things, but the good of their brethren*, 1 Cor.10.24. *Not to eat things sacrificed to idols, before the weake*, v.29. *To doe all for the glory of God*, *v.*32. Then is it sinne in the Ruler himselfe to scandalize the weake. *Ergo*, Rulers cannot command to others that as obedience, which they cannot doe themselves without prodigious disobedience to *God*. What *Paul* forbiddeth in Canonical Scripture as murther, that he cannot command in *Church Canons* as obedience Canonicall to Superiours.

3. Prelates shall have immediate Dominion over our consciences to bind us to obedience by doing acts that otherwise should *be imputed to us as the matter of our guiltinesse*; and because the same power that bindeth the conscience, may also loose, so they may dispense with all the ten Commandements, and coyne to us a new Decalogue, and a new Gospell. They may legitimate murthers, paricides, and illegitimate *Godlinesse*

(*f*) *Bernardus* 1 pist.7. *Quomodo ergo vel Abbatis jussio vel Papæ permissio, licitum facere potuit, quod purum malum fuit.*

(*g*) *Toletus* in Instruct. Sacerdot. lib 5. cap 3. *cum causa rationabili aliquid præcipitur — nos debemus audire, nec Papa pro suo libito excusat.*

(*h*) *Alphonsus* de potest legis Civil. cap.5. Conclus.5. *Potest subditus sine peccato legem aut preceptum superioris contemnere, judicando illud malum & contra rationem.*

and

and righteeusneſſe and ſobrietie, by this Divinitie.

4. That muſt be falſe (*It is better to obey God nor man*, Act. 5.) but to abſtaine from ſcandalizing a weake brother, is an act of obedience to the ſixt Commandement. *Ergo*, the contrary cannot be done at the command of Prelates. *6. Gods* poſitive lawes *yeildeth* (*Thou ſhalt not kill*) to wit to the law of nature. *David* may eat ſhew bread, when he is famiſhing. *Ergo*, the Prelates law farre more muſt yeild to the ſixt Commandement (*thou ſhalt not ſcandalize, nor kill the ſoule of him for whom Chriſt died.*) 7 Rulers muſt all be infallible law-makers. 8. Rulers might command bodilie murther, and it ſhould not be murther, they may command to digge pitts in the way of Travellers, *To marry with Infidels, to ſend abroad a goaring Ox*, to give knives to little children.

They object. *A Maſter, a father, may command a ſervant and a ſon to do that, which if the ſervant or ſon refuſe to do, their diſobedience ſcandalizeth. And again, a Maſter, a Father, may command the contrary, and if they diſobey, they ſcandalize culpably.* Erg. *The commanding will of a Maſter and a Father, and farre more of publick Rulers, may make that to be active ſcandall, which is no active ſcandall. A Carpenter may command his ſervant to remove a tree from the Eaſt end of his houſe, to the Weſt end, and againe, he may for his ſole will, to try his ſervants obedience, command him to remove it againe to the* Eaſt *end of his houſe.*

Anſwer. 1. The *Maſter, Father, Carpenter*, command either theſe things as artificiall agents, from reaſon of art, and then the queſtion is not touched, for in ſcandalls men are conſidered, as morall agents, or they command them as morall agents, and that either for their ſole will and pleaſure, and ſo they be idle and unreaſonable actions, and cannot be lawfull commandements, and ſo are they ſcandalous both to Commanders and obeyers, but they may well command upon juſt reaſons, that which if ſervants aud ſonnes obey not, they give Scandall, and they may command the contrary of that ſame, at another time, when now contrary reaſons maketh it lawfull and expedient, and if ſervants and ſonnes obey not the contrary, they alſo give Scandall, but here the change is not from the will and authoritie of the Commanders, but from the things themſelves, which

are changed, so that which is an active scandall at some time, the contrary of it may be an active scandall at another time, as in the case, *Rom.*14. To eat meats before the weake, which they conceive to be forbidden, by *Gods* law, is to slay him for whom *Christ* died, and an active scandall, because then the Ceremonies were mortall and indifferent, nothing essentially constituteth an active and a given scandall, but these two; 1. That it may be left undone, as the author of the course of conformitie, (*a*) saith well out of *Hieronimus, Without hurting of the truth of a sound life, and a sound faith and righteousnesse.* 2. If upon the practice of a thing indifferent, and not necessarie, any of the foresaid three wayes, we see some shall be scandalized, though they take scandall upon an unjust ground, it is an active scandall, as to eat such meats before the weake, *Rom.* 14. is in another time and case, as *Galat.*2. when the Ceremonies are now deadly, and upon just reasons not necessarie, the practising (I say) of the same, is an active scandall. and so if any be scandalized at the eating, *Rom.*14. it is scandall both taken, and also culpably given, and if any be scandalized at the not eating, as the case is, *Galat.*2. That is only a passive scandall, and so not given, because the times of the expyring of the dutie of Ceremonies, and the full promulgation of the Gospell, varieth the case now, and the sole will of Rulers maketh not the change; So if any offer Incence to the *Brazen Serpent*, so long as it hath vertue, as *Gods* ordinance to cure the stinged persons, he is scandalized by a passive scandall onely, for *Gods* institution maketh it now the necessary ordinance of *God*, And the Magistrates suffering of the Brazen Serpent to remaine now, is no active scandall, and the passive scandall is onely taken away, by information, and the sound exponing of the right use of a necessary ordinance of *God*. But after that the Brazen Serpent loseth its vertue, and is not now an ordinance of *God* necessarie, if any burne Incense to it, these who are by authoritie obliedged to remove it, and doth not remove it, they doe morally and culpably scandalize.

Hence we see it is foolish and vaine, that some say, such as (*c*) *Hooker*. (*d*) *D. Forbes*. (*e*) *D. Sanderson*, and (*f*) *Lyndesay*, pretended Bishop of *Edinburge*, and Mr. *Paybodie*. *That at* Rome

The essence of an active or given scandall.

(*a*) Course of conformitie, *pag* 147.

(*b*) *Dimittendum est, propter scandalum, omne quod potest prætermitti, salvâ triplice veritate vitæ doctrinæ & justitiæ,* Hierony. Gloss ord. tom 9.

(*c*) *Hooker* of Eccles. Policie, *l.*4 *pag.*157.

(*d*) *D. Forbes in Iren. lib.*2. *c.*20. *n.*19.

(*e*) *Sandersons* Sermon, *Rom.* 14 *pag.*22. 23.

(*f*) *Lyndesay* his defence of *Pearth* Assemb. *in Præfat* Paybodie.

Rome *and* Corinth *the Church had not past her determination upon eating, and not eating, nor made any Church lawes upon these things indifferent, and therefore to eat, or not to eat, were matters of every private mans choise; But it is not the like case with our Ceremonies, for they remaine no longer indifferent, but are necessarie to us, after that the* Church *hath now made a commanding law upon them, and so the scandall that ariseth from our dutie of obedience, to lawfull authoritie, is taken, and not given.*

I answer, it is most false, that eating, and not eating, in case of scandall was under no law in the *Church* of *Rome* and *Corinth*. For these most indifferent acts in their use, and cloathed with their Circumstances, when, where, and before what persons, were under the unalterable law of nature, as (*destroy not him, with thy meat for whom* Christ *died*) a law which as the (g) *course of conformitie* saith well, *cannot be dispenced with by no power but* Gods. And *Paul* proveth by stronger arguments, to eat in the case of Scandall, was not indifferent, but simply evill, Then all the Prelates Canons on earth can afford, as *Rom.*14. by eight Arguments, as we have seen, that it fighteth against Charitie, *v.*15. *Now walkest thou not charitably.* 2. *It is a destroying of him for whom* Christ *died*, and so murther. 3. Contrary to *Christs* love, *who died for that weake brother.* 4. It maketh Religion and Christian Libertie to be evill spoken of. *v.*6. *&c.* It is a shame then to say, that eating, or not eating, was indifferent, because free from any ty of a *Church Canon*, seeing eating before a weake brother, is under the ty of unanswerable Arguments taken from the law of nature, and *Gods Canons* written in the heart, forbidding under the pain of *God's anathema*, and curse, (heavier then the *Church anathema*,) that we should, *for meat, destroy him for whom Christ died*, and so are the Canon-makers, and Lords of Ceremonies under a curse, if they for crossing, kneeling, surplice, *destroy him for whom Christ died*, or command him to be destroyed, by the practice of Ceremonies. 3. If this be a good reason the *Church* of *Rome*, and *Corinth* might have made such Ceremonies as these.

(g) Course of Conformitie, *pag.*146.

Notwithstanding the eating of meates, which some suppose to be forbidden by Gods *law, be a killing of him for whom Christ died, and against Charity, and a reproaching of our Christian li-*

berte, yet it seemed good to the holy Ghost, and to us, the Prelates of Rome *and* Corinth, *to command eating of such meats, before weake ones for whom Christ died.* But certainly *Paul* would never have commanded, in a Canon, that which he writeth in Canonicall Scripture, *to be a murthering of him for whom Christ died*, and that which he would not practise himself, *to the worlds end*, so long as it standeth in the case of indifferencie, as he saith of eating of fleshes, conceived by some weake ones to be against *Gods* law, 1 *Cor.* 8. *v.* last, The *Pope* himselfe would, nor dare in conscience, to practise any of his owne Canons, even though they were yet not Canonically commanded or forbidden. *Paul* would not dare to put a law upon the *Romans* or *Corinthians*, to eat, or not to eat meats, before the weake, but commandeth not eating in the case of scandall. 4. *Idolatrie is ever idolatrie,* (a) Pag. 143. (saith (a) *the course of conformitie*) *and so scandall being sinne it cannot cease to be sinne, because superiours commandeth it.* 5. Though *Apostolick authoritie* being meerly divine, should command that which is in it self murther, and was murther, before it be Canonically commanded, (which I think also is a false hypothesis) yet it shall never follow that humane authoritie, or Ecclesiastick authoritie can command scandall, which is spirituall murther; For if Ecclesiastick authoritie may command murther, they may command idolatrie, for active scandalizing is as essentially *murthering of one for whom* Christ *died*, as to worship an idoll, is essentially idolatrie. Therefore Master *Sydserfe* pretended *Bishop of Galloway* being straited with this argument, sayd, *Though humane authoritie cannot invert the nature of things, or make spirituall murther, to be no murther, yet they can by a* Church Canon *put the mindes of people in such a change, as now they are not in the hazard to be justly scandalized, for a scandall* (sayd the Prelate) *is ens rationis, no reall thing, but a fiction of reason, the nature of it being in the apprehension of the ignorant and blind, who are scandalized, and a law may remove this ignorance, when it giveth light, and sheweth the expediencie of things indifferent.* To which I answered, you may, call idolatrie, if you please, and all sinnes, fictions of reason, but not only doth scandall given proceed from ignorance and blindnesse of the apprehension of the partie scandalized, but

alſo from the unſeaſonable practiſing of a thing, which is no wayes neceſſarie in the worſhip of *God*. The courſe of (*b*) conformitie ſaith well, *He that denieth that there is any ſcandall, is like one who could not ſee the wood, for the trees --the walking of* Diogenes *is meeteſt for a* Zeno, *who againſt all reaſon denyeth that there is any motion.* We may hence judge what to ſay of (*c*) D. *Forbes* his *Anſwer* to the place, 1 *Cor.*9. *Who ſaith that* Paul *was under no Eccleſiaſticall law, not to take wages, and therefore in not taking wages, he was not a contemner of Eccleſiaſticall authoritie, but we are under a* Church *law to practiſe the Ceremonies, and yet we refuſe them.* I anſwer; If then the *Church* of *Corinth* had commanded *Paul* in their Canons to take ſtipend, for preaching, he was obliedged to take ſtipend, yet he proveth that it was not lawfull for him, as the caſe of ſcandall then ſtood, to take wages, *v.*18. *he ſhould abuſe his power in the Goſpell*, and *v.*19.20.21. *he ſhould not have becommed all things to all men. to ſave ſome*, and theſe things had been ſinfully ſcandalous, if (as the caſe was then) *Paul* for a penny of wages, which he might have wanted, having no familie to provide for, ſhould have layd a ſtumling block before many. And the *Doctor* (*d*) ſaith *No humane power can compell a man, to doe that, which he cannot doe, except inevitably he give ſcandall.* The *Doctor* addeth; *The Apoſtle teacheth not that to take ſtipend was unlawfull, or of it ſelfe ſcandalous, yea he taught it was lawfull, and that they ſhould not be ſcandalized thereat, becauſe* Chriſt *hath ordained, that he who ſerveth at the altar, ſhould live upon the Altar, but you teach that the Ceremonies are unlawfull.* I Anſwer 1. In this argument of Scandall, we give, but doe not grant, that they are not unlawfull, but indifferent. 2. Though to take wages be lawfull, yet it followeth not, that it is not in *Pauls* caſe at *Corinth* of it ſelfe ſcandalous; for to eat all meates is lawfull, *Rom.*14. and 1 *Cor.*10.23. *All things are lawfull, v.*26. *The earth is the Lords*, yet to eat before the weake, was in it ſelfe ſcandalous, *Rom.*14.15.16.17. 1 *Cor.*10.28.29. 3. It is a moſt weake reaſon to prove that to take wages was not ſcandalous, becauſe forſooth the *Corinthians ſhould not have been ſcandalized*: for to be ſcandalized is to ſinne, and there is no reaſon in ſinning, ἐν τῇ ἀνοίᾳ ἁμαρτία πεγνοία. If this be good, adulterie

(*b*) Courſe of Conformitie. pag. 143.

(*c*) *Forbes Iren. l.*2. *cap.*20. *n.*6.

(*d*) *Forbes*, lib 2. cap. 20. n.19. *Non poteſt humana poteſtas te cogere ad faciendum illud quod facere non poſſis abſq; inevitabili datione ſcandali.*

adulterie and murther in *David*, is not of it selfe scandalous, for as no man hath reason to sinne, so no man hath reason to be scandalized, at *Davids* sinne. *Pauls* taking wages at *Corinth* should have been a sinfull hindering of the Gospels progresse, and therefore of it self sinfull; and so of it selfe scandalous. But I return to the *Doctors*.

Duplyers *pag* 67.68. *n.*46 47.

As for that which yee say, that when Scandall may be taken at the doing of the thing commanded, then the thing commanded becommeth inexpedient, and so ought not to be obeyed; that yee be not more deceived with this errour, we pray you marke, that a thing commanded, by our Superiours, in Church or Policie, may be two wayes inexpedient, to wit, either in respect of some particular Persons, who through weakneſſe, or malice, doe stumble at it, or else in respect of the body in generall, because it is contrary to Order, Decencie and Edification. If the thing commanded be inexpedient, the former way, we may indeed, in such a case, for eschewing the Scandall of the weake, forbeare the practice of the thing commanded, Hic, & nunc, *in some particular places, and times: provyding alwayes we doe this without offence of our Superiours, and without the scandall of others; but we cannot totally forbeare practice, for we are to looke more to the utilitie, which the body of the* Church *may receive, by the thing commanded, and by our obedience to our Superiours, then to some particular persons.* 47. *But if the thing commanded be in our private judgement inexpedient, the other way, we ought not for that, to deny Obedience to the lawes of the Church; for when the inexpediencie of a thing is questionable, and probable arguments may be brought,* pro *and* contra, *concerning the expediencie of it, wee have sufficient warrant to practiſe it, if the Church inact it as expedient. Otherwayes your way is so dangerous, that there shall never be peace, nor unitie in the Church, for men ordinarily are divided in judgement, concerning the expediencie of things. Suppose a Synode consisting of one hundred Pastours, threescore shall think this particular Ceremonie expedient, for the good of the* Church, *and in respect of pluralitie of voyces, make an act to be concluded for the establiſhing of it, shall the remnant fourty, who are of the contrary judgement, deny obedience to the acts of the Synode?* Answer

Answer. 1. This distinction of inexpedient in the matter of indifferent Ceremonies is *Popish* and vaine, for if the Ceremonie be indifferent, and may be wanted in the worship of *God* (as these Ceremonies be) if *one soule, for whom Christ died,* shall be murthered thereby, it is *hoc ipso,* to be judged inexpedient and scandalous in it selfe, and so cannot fall under the object of a *Church Canon,* as 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. *If meat make my brother to stumble* (he saith not the whole Church) *I will not eat. Ergo,* he cannot command others to eat. 1 *Cor.* 10. 28. *But if any man,* ἐὰν δέ τις, *say to you, this is offered in sacrifice to Idols, eat not,* δι ἐκεῖνον μηνύσαντα, *for his sake that shewed it. Ergo,* if it seem expedient, and so be scandalous to one, let alone to a whole Church, we are totally to forbeare it, and *Paul* would, *while the world standeth* 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. *forbeare it.* 2. You will not have us to forbeare a thing indifferent, that actively (for the passive scandall, I hope, you regard not as a scandall) doth scandalize, but with a provision *that we doe it without offence of Superiours, and without the scandall of others.* But I aske, Doctors, what you meane by *Offence of Superiours,* if you meane without displeasing and inciting our Superiours to anger. 1. You ignorantly confound *displeasing* and *Scandalizing.* When a Pastor reboketh Superiours, as *Jeremiah, Elias,* and *John Baptist,* in the good old world did they did *displease* Superiours, but not *scandalize* them; yea, they did edifie their Superiours, while as they did offend them. It is wicked Divinitie, to mean, that we are not to eschew the murthering of a weake brother for whom *Christ* died, providing we offend not, that is, displease not our Superiours. Will you to please men displease the *God of heaven,* and commit spiritual homicide? This is worse then Poperie.

But if you meane, that wee are to *forbeare the thing commanded for eschewing the scandall of the weake, providing we doe it without the offence of Superiours,* that is without the active scandalizing of Superiours, then 1. your distinction is vaine, for if we scandalize culpably our superiours by our forbearance, though it be inexpedient to all private persons, we are not to forbeare, because in no case can we breake the sixt Commandement, and scandalize our Superiours. 2. You shall be forced to give a case, wherein we are necessitated by *Gods*

providence, and that by way of contradiction, whether we forbeare, or forbeare not, to murther either the soules of some weake ones, or the soules of Superiours, by our forbearance of the practice of things judged expedient by Superiours, you make us to murther the soules of Superiours by the non-forbearance, or you will have us to murther the soules of weake breathren, if we practise. This is a wronging of Providence, and a *Manichean* tenent, that we can be under such a necessitie of sinning. Yea, there must be two contrary revealed wills in *God*, commanding, by forbearing the Ceremonies, not to murther Superiours, and commanding by not forbearing, not to murther weak brethren; and so *God* commandeth both to forbeare, and also not to forbeare. If you say, the weake may be informed, and then it is a passive scandall onely, and practising is lawfull at the commandement of Superiours. I answer, 1. Then your distinction hath no use here. 2. I answer. Let the Superiours, who have more knowledge, be informed, that to abstaine from a practice, that may murther any one redeemed by *Christ*, is *Christs* commandement (*Thou shalt doe no murther*) then it is but a passive scandall, and not an active, or culpably given scandall. *Ergo*. we are *to forbeare* the thing commanded *for eschewing of the scandall* (*hic & nunc*) of the weake, even though with the offence, that is the passive scandall of Superiours and others, which is contradictorie to the Doctours. 3. If we may forbeare obedience to *Gods* positive Commandements, *hic & nunc*, for eschewing of Scandall, farre more may we, *hic & nunc*, not crosse, not kneele, *hic & nunc*, when crossing and kneeling murthereth *one for whom Christ died*, even though *it offend our Superiours*. *Ergo*, this provision of the Doctors is vaine; and Superiours are unjustly offended, if our non-murthering of weake brethren offend them, nor are we to care for the Doctors provision here. 4. No utilitie can truly redound to the whole *Church* by practising of an indifferent thing which culpably occasioneth the murthering of a weake brother, Except our Doctors meane, that sinne may edifie the whole Church. 5. They say, if the things in our private judgement be inexpedient the second way, that is to the *Church*, the *Church* cannot Command them, except the *Church* command against

her

her conſcience. 6. If matters in their expediencie be queſtionable and probable on both ſides, the *Churches* determination ſhould end the controverſie (ſaith the Doctors) this is the Doctrine of the Jeſuites, (*a*) *Suarez.* (*b*) *Thomas Sanches,* and (*c*) *Gregor. de valent.* as I ſhew before (*d*) when a thing is probable, and I be reſolved in conſcience againſt neither of the ſides, and feare the one ſide be murthering him, for whom *Chriſt* died, which is againſt Gods commandement, and know that humane authoritie commandeth the contrary and am perſwaded it is indifferent, and a poſitive commandement of men, if the Churches determination be here to ſway my conſcience; to practiſe, is to me blind obedience, for humane authoritie as it is ſuch, giveth no light: *Ergo,* it cannot remove my doubting, and beget faith; and alſo the conſcience is ſo much the bolder to venture on a ſinne, againſt *God,* for feare of eſchewing a ſinne againſt men, which is queſtionable, and in a matter indifferent, this is alſo the ſtout conſcience of *Bonaventura 2 ſent. diſt. 39. plus eſt ſtandum præcepto Prælati, quam conſcientiæ.* 7. Our Doctors ſay, our way is againſt the peace of the *Church:* But I anſwer, their way is Popiſh, and againſt the truth of *God,* in commanding our conſciences to reſt upon the wicked will of men. And their inſtance of a Synod of a hundred Paſtors may be brought aſwell to prove the Synode of *Trent* is to be obeyed, as for the preſent purpoſe,

(*a*) *Suarez* de Rel. to. 4 l. 4. tract. 5. cap 15. *Si, ſeclusâ præcepto, res ex utrâq; parte ſit probabilis tunc universaliter verum erit adjuncto præcepto obediendum eſſe.*

(*b*) *Thom. Sanchez* in Decalog. to. 2. lib 6. cap. 3. n. 3.

(*c*) *Greg. de Val.* to. 3. diſp 7 q 3 punct. 2

(*d*) *Supra* q. 6. of this Treatiſe.

Duplyers, *pag. 69.*

Yee will ſay this argument is Popiſh, and leadeth men to acquieſce, *without tryall, upon the determination of the* Church. *But we anſwer in matters of faith the truth, whereof may be infallibly concluded out of the word of God, we ought not, without tryall to* acquieſce *unto the Doctors of the* Church, *and in this reſpect we diſſent from Papiſts, who aſcribe too much to the authoritie of Councells, as if their decrees were infallible. But in matters of Policie, if we be certaine, that in their owne nature, they are indifferent, and if the expediencie of them onely be called in queſtion, ſeeing no certaine concluſion, concerning their expediencie, can be infallibly drawn out of Gods word — we are to* acquieſce *to the decrees of the Church.* 1. *Becauſe otherwiſe it is impoſſible to agree*

in one conclusion, in matters of this kind. 2. *Disobedience shall prove more hurtfull then obedience.*

Answer 1. This is a wide step, to make all things in Scripture, either matters of faith, or matters indifferent. *That there were eight persons in* Noahs *Arke, and that* Sampson *slew a thousand with the jaw bone of an asse*, are not matters of faith, as matters of faith are contradistinguished, from things indifferent, many are saved, who neither know nor believe many things of this historicall veritie in Scripture, yet are they not matters indifferent. But the Doctors are reconcilers with the *Belgik Arminians*, who deny all the things contraverted betwixt *Papists* and us, and betwixt us and *Arminians*, and *Anabaptists*, at least the most part of them to be fundamentall, and that either side may be believed, and holden, without hazard of salvation, and therefore we are to leane to the Churches determination in these without farther inquirie. 2. They mean, that in matters contraverted, and in all things indifferent; as whether in this, or that fact, we doe *murther him for whom Christ died*; Wee are to give our faith and conscience over to the *Church* without further tryall. 3. What if wee bee not perswaded of the indifferencie of the things commanded but doubt whether they bee commanded or forbidden in the Word, as is now the present case of ceremonies to us, for we cannot be perswaded of their indifferencie, and the Doctors saith they are not matters of faith. *Ergo*, by their own doctrine their distinction is defective. 4. Scripture is also perfect in resolving us, what is scandall and murthering of our brother, as what is *Idolatrie* and *Blasphemie*, and therefore we are not to hang our faith here upon the *Churches* Canons without farther tryall, as you say. 5. That the Scripture is perfect in matters of faith, but imperfect in matters of Policie, that is in matters wherein we may kill him for whom *Christ died*, is no better then the Papists distinction, who teach us that the Scripture is perfect in the articles of faith, not in traditions, so *Scotus* (*a*) saith, *True Theologie according to Divine revelation is onely of things in Scripture, or which may be deduced out of Scripture*. And *Suarez* (*b*) saith, *Things that belong to accidentarie rites are left to the Churches determination, but the Scripture implicitly containeth all articles of faith*

(*a*) *Scotus* prol. in sent. q. 3. ad ar. 3.

(*b*) *Suarez* to. de leg. cap. 1 & de trip. virt. Theologica, Tract. 1. disp. 5. q. 4.

faith. And so saith (*c*) *Bannes*, and (*d*) *Duvallius*. 6. Your feare is vain, that we shall have no order nor peace, if Scripture be judge, and not the authoritie of the Church, in matters which you call indifferent, for the Church giveth out Canons concerning things strangled, & blood, which were matters indifferent, and that from the word of *God*, Act. 15. and that in great unitie and peace. *Gods* word maketh unitie, and not mens authoritie. 7. Disobedience to Church Canons in case of given Scandall, is neither disobedience, nor hurteth at all; It possibly offendeth men who will tyrannize over the Conscience, and if any be induced thereby to sin, it is a scandall taken, not given. Abstinence from murthering a weak brother, is obedience to *God*, and so no active Scandall.

(*c*) *Bannes*, tom. in q. 1. art. 10. dub 2.
(*d*) *Duvallius*, 2 tract. de legib. q. 5. art. 1. ad arg. 2.

In the 48 Section, The Duplyers doe but redouble over again the arguments already brought and answered by me divers times to D. *Robert Barron* in private, while he was silenced, and (as I conceived) satisfied. *Especially, they say our disobedience to superiours in things lawfull and expedient, is most scandalous to others, and that because we, by nature, are most unwilling to be curbed, and to have our libertie restrained. Therefore* Calvin *saith, God, that he may allure us to obedience to Superiours, called, superiours, Parents.*

Calv. in Instit. lib. 2 cap. 8. sect. 35.

I answer. 1. The Doctors are too hastie to call that obedience to Superiours which is in question, We say it is disobedience to the sixt Commandement, because it is a scandalizing of our brother. *Ergo*, it is not obedience to the fift Commandement to practise indifferent Ceremonies, when they doe scandalize. 2. Our argument is made against the practise of Ceremonies, before they be enacted in a lawfull Assemblie, if they be murthering of the weak, before *Pearth-Assemblie*, the will of Prelates, yea, and all the authoritie of men or Angels, cannot make the practise of them, to be no murther, for mens will cannot make that which is sinne and guiltinesse before *God*, to be no sinne, but due obedience to the fift Commandement, though the Doctors expresly say this.

Duplyers, *pag.* 71. *Sect.* 44.

But we with good warrant doe averre, that the precept which forbiddeth the resisting of the civill power, and in generall the de-

nying of obedience to the lawfull commandements of our Superiors, is of greater obligation then the precept of not ſcandalizing. Their firſt reaſon I put in forme to them thus. That is of greater obligation which commandeth acts edificative to all, then that which commandeth acts edificative to ſome only, for the good of all is to be preferred to the good of ſome particular perſons, and we are to have a greater care of the ſalvation of all, then of ſome. But the precept of obedience to Superiours is univerſall, and commandeth the act of edifying all, to wit, obedience to Superiours, and an act to eſchew the ſcandall of all to wit, diſobedience. But the precept of eſchewing the ſcandall of ſome, doth but edifie ſome only, and not all. Ergo *&c.*

Anſ. 1. It is ſoon proved by your learning, for the precept of *Gods* law to eſchew ſcandall, to you is no precept, and ſo of no obligation, when Superiours command to ſcandalize, ſo you may prove that ſnow is whiter then the raven, when as the raven is not white at all.

I anſwer. 2. *That precept is of greater obligation that commandeth acts edificative to all, then that which commandeth acts edificative to ſome.* It is true, 1. if it be a lawfull command of *God*, but the aſſumption applyed to your purpoſe is moſt falſe, the command to obey Prelates, when they command things indifferent, the obedience whereof doth culpably occaſion the *murthering of him, for whom Chriſt died*, is not a commandement edificative to all, yea, it is a Commandement of acts deſtructive to the ſoules of all. This Argument would have ſome colour, if it were not a vaine begging of the queſtion, for they lay downe as confeſſed, that the practiſe of Ceremonies, from whence many ſoules are ruined, is obedience, and obedience to the fift Commandement. This is to be proven, and conſtantly denyed by us, becauſe diſobedience to the ſixth Commandement, and murthering of our brother, cannot be obedience to the fift Commandement.

Duplyers pag. 72. n. 50.

Amef. Medull. l 2 c. 17. ſect. 13.

The fift Commandement commeth neerer to the nature of pietie and religion contained in the firſt Table, and the honouring of parents (as your owne Ameſius *ſaith) by prophane authours is called*

called by the name of religion and pietie. 2. *It is the ground of obedience (sayeth* Pareus) *to be given to all the rest of the precepts of the second Table.* 1. *Because all societies Oeconomicke, civill, and Ecclesiasticke doe consist, and are conserved by the subjection of inferiours to superiours.* 2. *Our superiours are set over us, to the end, we may doe our dutie to all others. Hence, saith your owne* Amesius; *Crymes which directly procure the perturbation, confusion, and eversion of societies, are more grievous then the violation of the singular precepts: and* Dyonisius *Bishop of* Alexandria, *writing to* Novatus saith, *Martyrdome suffered for eschewing of schisme, is more glorious, then Martyrdome for eschewing Idolatrie.*

Ans. You said before matters of Policie are not matters of faith. *Amesius* is a Protestant writer in matters of faith, by grant of all, it is like then you terme *Amesius our owne,* not yours, because he wrote against *Arminians* and *Papists,* and so that *Arminians* and *Papists* are yours, and Protestant Divines ours. 2. We grant the precedencie and dignitie to the fift Commandement above the rest, but your Ceremonies that break the sixth Commandement, shall find no roome in the fift Commandement. Cause the fift Commandement speak thus, if you can; *Notwithstanding, that crossing, kneeling, surplice, humane holy dayes occasion the soule murther of him for whom Christ died, yet we the Prelates command the practise of the foresaid Ceremonies as good and expedient for edification, for our Commandement maketh the murthering of our brethren, to be obedience to the fift Commandement.* But if Prelates may command that which would be otherwise, without, or before the Commandement, spirituall murthering and scandalizing of our brother, they may command also, that which would be otherwise without, or before their command, adulterie against the seventh, and theft against the eighth; and perjurie and lying against the ninth Commandement, and concupiscence against the tenth; for the fift Commandement hath the precedencie before the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth Commandements, no lesse then before the sixth, which forbiddeth the killing of our brothers soule. 3. What *Amesius* and *Pareus* saith, doe well prove the dignitie of the fift Commandement, above all the Commandements of

the

the second Table; but this is not to our purpose, but every commandement of the fifth Commandement; yea, every commandement of the first Table, is not above every commandement of the second Table. The love of *God*, is more then the love of our neighbour, and the love of *God* should, and doth, command obedience to all the ten Commandements, *Dent.* 30. 6 7,8. & *Deut.* 10.12. Yet every duty and commandement that the love of *God* requireth of us, as to offer sacrifice, is not for that a greater commandement then every commandement of the second Table, yea, the taking of a sheepe out of a ditch on the Lords day, commanded in the sixth Commandement, is more then sacrifices commanded in the second Commandement, as our *Saviour* saith, *Math.* 12.*v.* 11,12. and though the fift Commandement be laid upon us as the fountaine and cause, yea to this end, that we should keepe all the rest, as Divines say well. Yet it followeth not that every commandement of the fift Commandement, as when my father commandeth me to preach in a linnen Ephod, and to cast a Character with my thumbe in the aire, as crossing is, shall be of more obligation then this commandement of *God* (*Thou shalt not destroy his soule for whom Christ died*) 4. It is false, that denying of obedience to *Pearth-Assemblie*, commanding indifferent straws and feathers as (kneele to consecrated Bread, the Image of Christ crucified) doth *directly procure* the perturbation and *confusion of humane societies*, as the *Doctors* saith. There is great difference betwixt subjection to superiours, and obedience to superiours; When private men, as the three Children will not bow to *Nebuchadnezzars* Image, there is no confusion brought in for that, if they had risen against the King in armes, as *Papists* doe in *Ireland* against our King, that is confusion, and subverteth directly humane societies, but to suffer punishment by Superiours, is subjection to superiours, as is cleare, 1 *Pet.* 2 17. *Honour the King.* 18. *Servants be subject to your Masters with all feare, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward.* 19. *For this is thanke-worthy* (this subjection) *if a man for conscience toward* God, *endure griefe, suffering wrongfully.* 5. What *Dionysius* said of the ill of schisme is for us, for schisme is against love to our brethren, and a renting *Christs* body. 1 *Cor.* 1.13. and a greater

ter evill then non-obedience to *Prelates*, when they command indifferent Ceremonies, occasioning the ruine of *him for whom Christ died*. To say nothing that the *Doctors of Aberdeen* are the Schismaticks who have now separated from the Church of *Scotland*, and our Nationall covenant with *God*.

Duplyers pag. 37. n. 51.

Thirdly, these offices or duties, which we owe to others, by way of Justice, are more strictly obligatorie, then these which we owe to them, only by way of charitie. But we owe the dutie of obedience to our Superiours, by way of justice, and therefore it is more obligatorie, then the duty of eschewing scandall causlesly taken, which is a duty only of charity. 1. *The major is a maxime not only of Scholasticks, and of Popish casuists, but also of our Divines. So* Amesius, *The major is cleare, for the duty of obedience which wee owe to the publicke Lawes of the Church and Kingdome is,* Justitia legalis, *a generall legall Justice, and as it is in subjects, it is a vertne inclining them to the obedience of all lawes made for the benefit of the Common-wealth, as* Aristotle *saith.* 2. *It is* debitum obedientiæ, *the debt of obedience which we owe to our Superiours, grounded upon the proper right which our Superiours have to exact this right of us, so that they may accuse us of injurie, and censure us, if we performe it not.* Debitum justitiæ fundatur in proprio jure alterius; *and also it is* debitum morale, *a debt of dutie unto which we are tyed by morall honestie in* Gods *commandement. There is a great difference betwixt these two debts; As for example, a man oweth moneys to the poore by a morall debt, but to his creditours he oweth them by a legall debt, or debt of justice: and therefore he is more strictly obliged to pay his creditour then to give almes. Such like by morall honestie, and* Gods *precept also; a man oweth to his neighbour, a pious carefulnesse, to impede sinne in him, by admonition, instruction, good example, and by omission even of things lawfull, when he seeth that his neighbour in respect of his weakenesse, will be scandalized by them. But his neighbour hath not such a right to exact these duties of him, neither can he have action against him, for not performing of them, as our lawfull Superiours have for our due obedience?*

Medul. Theol. l. 2. c. 16. s. 58 59. 60. 61. 62 63.

Ans. 1. Here be the white shifts of Mr. *Sanderson*, *Paybodie*,

Downham, who place Loyaltie above Charitie. *We owe to our brother love, but to the Ruler* (say they) *love and justice.* 1. Why doe they not extend Loyaltie to its utmost, even loyaltie to the King of kings? whose royall law saith (*Thou shalt not scandalize* (*Thou shalt not murther*) they draw in loyaltie to Rulers who shall die as men, and to their commandement of things indifferent, which *God* hath not commanded. 2. It is true, *these duties which we owe to others by way of justice, are more obligatorie then these which we owe only by way of charitie, cæteris paribus*, When duties of the law of Nature, and morall Law, are compared together, then indeed the duties which we owe, both by the tye of *Justice* and *Charitie*, are more obligatorie, then the duties *that we* owe only by the tye of *Charitie*. As for example; My father is in danger, before my eyes, to be drowned, in one deepe water; and before my eyes also, my neighbour and friend is in danger of the like kind; the two tyes and bands of Justice and Charitie, both by the fifth and sixth Commandements are more obligatorie, *hic & nunc*, and doe more strictly obliege, that I run to succour, and preserve the life of my father, then the life of my neighbour, for the obligation to my neighbour, is only charitie, by the obligation of the sixth Commandement, which obligation ceaseth, *hic & nunc*, at this time, when my fathers life is in hazard; and thus farre the Doctors argument goeth for strong, as *Schoolemen*, *Casuists*, and Divines teach. But it is not to a purpose for the Doctors; For all offices and duties generally, and universally, of what ever kind, which we owe by way of Justice, are not more obligatorie, then duties which we owe, only by way of Charitie, as when duties of a positive commandement of *God*, enjoyned by our Superiours, and duties which we owe by charitie only, are compared together, then the Doctors major Proposition *is not cleare of it selfe*, as they dreame, nor doe *Casuists* or *Amesius*, or Divines say with them, but truth, and all our Divines say against them. Let us suppose that the King, and Convocation, and Assembly of *Priests* and *Prophets* of *Israel* make a Canon according to Gods Word. *That no manner of man presume to eat shew-bread, save the Priests only.* All men owe obedience to this, both because it is *Gods* expresse Law, and by the band

of

of Justice, the Elders and Assembly of the Ancients have forbidden it. But if our Doctors argument stand strong, *David* at the point and hazard of famishing for hunger, sinned in eating shew-bread, yet *Christ* acquiteth him of all sinne, and saith *Math.* 12. 5. he and his followers are ἀναίτιοι, blameless. Now *David* was under a dutie by mercy, and love to his owne life, and the lives of his followers, to eat shew-bread, and he was under the band of Justice, by the law of the *Ancients of Israel*, and *Gods* law, not to eat. Therefore in some cases, when our Superiours commandements are only positive Lawes, they are not more obligatorie, then duties of charitie, only commanded in the law of nature. I cleare it further thus, I see my neighbour in danger before my eyes of drowning, and my father commandeth me to goe and labour, or sowe his farme in that time, while I am to preserve the life of my neighbour in present danger, to lose his life, in a great water. By the Doctors maxime, I am under the higher obligatorie tye of Justice, to obey my father, who commandeth a thing both lawfull and necessarie, by vertue of the higher Commandement, to wit, the first of the second Table, then I am obliged by the sixth Commandement, and of charitie only, to give present succour and help to my dying neighbour, so I must let my neighbour die in the waters, to give a dutie of justice to my father, of farre lesse necessitie. I would not commit my conscience to such *Casuists*, as are the *Doctors* of *Aberdeen*. But if the Doctors would see with some new light of reason, it is cleare, that not only the tye of Justice maketh the precept more obligatorie, but also the weightinesse of the thing commanded; Yea, and if the positive Commandements of the *Lord our God*, who of Justice and kingly soveraigntie, hath right to aske obedience of us above all earthly Superiours, doe yeeld and cede as lesse obligatorie, then commandements of love only, that are commanded in the law of nature. What doe our Doctors clatter and fable to us of a right of Justice, that mortall Rulers have to command in things indifferent, from which the destruction of soules doth arise? for these commandements of Rulers, (*kneele religiously before bread, the vicegerent image of Christ crucified*) (*keepe humane holy-dayes*) *Crosse the aire with your thumb above a baptized*

infants face) at best, are but positive Commandements, not warranted by Gods word. But shall they be more obligatorie by a supposed band of Justice that Prelates have over us to command, such toy's then this divine law of *God* and Nature, *Rom.* 14. *For indifferent dayes, meats, surplice, destroy not him for whom Christ died?* All the Casuistes, and Schoolemen, *Navarra, Sylvester, Sanchez, Raphael de la Torre, Meratius, Duvallius, Thomas, Scotus, Bonaventura, Suarez. Vasquez, Grego. de Valentia, Albertus, Richardus, Biel, Corduba, Angelus, Adrianus, Alphonsus, Becanus*, yea, and all the hoast of our Divines cry with Scripture, that Mercie and the precepts of Love, and of the Law of nature, are more obligatorie then Sacrifice, burnt offerings, and Gods owne positive lawes, yea, and that positive lawes lose their obligatorie power, and cease to be lawes, when the lawes of nature and necessarie duties of mercie and love (*as not to murther our brother*) (*not to scandalize*) standeth in their way. I might wearie the reader here with citations, and bewilder my selfe also, but it is a point of Divinitie denyed by none at all. 3. What we owe of Justice to our Superiours, is indeed both a morall debt of obedience, and a debt of justice, and law which Rulers may seeke by their place, and *ex jure*, as *Aristotle* saith, but this right is limited, Rulers have no right to seeke absolute obedience, but only *in the Lord*, not against charitie. And though the place of Rulers be authoritative, yet their commanding power, as touching the matter of what they injoyne is only Ministeriall, and they cannot but in Gods place exact, that which is *Gods due*; and seeing *God* himselfe, if he should immediatly in his owne person command, he would not urge a positive commandement, farre lesse the commandement of light and vaine Ceremonies, against and beyond the precept of love, not to destroy a soule for whom *Christ* died. *Ergo*, Superiours under *God*, who borrow all their right from *God*, cannot have a higher right then *God* hath. 4. The comparison of a man who oweth moneys to a Creditor, and oweth moneys to the poore, is close off the way, for he is obliged to pay the Creditour first, but the case here is farre otherwise; The debt of practising indifferent feathers and straws, such as kneeling, crossing, wearing Surplice, is neither

like

like the debt owine to the poore, nor to the creditour; For natures law, and *Gods* word, 1 *Cor.*10.18,19. maketh the non-practise, non-murthering obedience to *God*, when the practise of indifferent things, is a soule-stumbling to the weake, and the practising is but at its best obedience to a positive Law, and ought to stoope, and goe off the way, and disappeare when natures Law (Murther not) doth come in its way. When the Doctors put *Loyaltie* above *Charitie*, they suppose obedience to commandements commanding scandalizing of soules to be loyaltie to Superiours, which is questioned, it being treason to the Soveraigne of heaven and earth, to destroy his Image, it is taken as loyalty by our Doctors, but not proven to be loyaltie, and so a vaine question here, whether Loyaltie be above Charitie or not. But I dismisse the Doctors till another occasion. Other things as Popish tenents, in their booke are a thousand times answered by us.

Quest. V.

Whether or not in every indifferent thing are we to eschew the scandall of all, even of the malicious?

IT is knowne that many take offence at tolling of Bells, at a Ministers gowne while hee preacheth, at the naming of the dayes of the weeke, after the Heathen style from the seven Planets, as *Sunday*, the day of the Sunne; *Moonday*, the day of the Moon, *&c.* It is true, Bells are abused by Papists, while as they be consecrated, baptized, used to chase away devils. But these be scandals taken, and not given, for we read not of scandals culpable in Gods word, but there be some apparent morall reason in them. 2. The object scandalizing hath no necessitie, why it should be. Now there is a necessitte of Bells to give warning to convocate the people to *Gods* worship, and they are of meere civill use, and have no morall influence in the worship, for the same tolling of bells is, and may be used to convocate the people to a Baron-court, to heare a declamation, to convocate Souldiers; there is

no

no apparent morall reason why the tolling of a Bell should scandalize, and the toller of the Bell for warning of the bodily and personall convocation of the people, is not a morall agent properly; the action of tolling remaineth within the sphere of an action physicall, *in lineâ Physicâ, non in lineâ morali aut religiosâ aut Theologicâ*, for so here I must contradistinguish a Physicall action from a Religious action. 2. The tolling of bels have a necessitie of expediencie, I mean necessity *in specie*, in the kind, though not in *individuo*, in the particular, and no particular can be more fit and convenient: people must have some publique signe for the dyat of meeting, else the worship would be wearisome to those who met long before the time, and it would be scandalous and inconvenient, to others to meet after the publick worship is begun. If any say, tolling of Bells is not necessarie, sounding of Trumpets, beating of Drummes may be civill signes of convocating people; touling of bells being so fouly abused by Papists to superstition, and so being not necessarie ought to be removed. But I answer, beating of Drummes wanteth the necessitie of conveniencie, as in raynie weather it could not be, nor can they give warning so conveniently: blowing of Trumpets might seeme as Jewish, *Joel cap.2.v.15.* as tolling of Bells seemeth Popish, and the degrees of necessitie of conveniencie should sway the Churches determination in these cases, and this exsuperancie of necessitie of conveniencie is in all things, though we cannot see it alwayes. 2. The instamped civill gravitie in a Gowne, maketh it necessary with the necessitie of expediencie, being in it selfe a grave habit fit for an Oratour who is to perswade. 3. The names of dayes to signifie civill times and things, out of a religious state is necessary now: and the Holy Ghost doth use for civill signification such termes, as *Mars-street* to signifie civill and meerely historically such a place. And the Ship *whose signe is Castor & Pollux*, yet these were heathen names, and most superstitious, and cannot be used in a religious state. I grant, we may not term our *Jehovah*, *Jupiter* or *Baal*; nor *Christ*, *Mercurius*, though he be the word of *Gods* mind to us, for *God* teacheth us other words and language in his Word. The truth is, that (a) learned noble Lord said well and judiciously, *all the indifferencie (in the*

(a) *Robert* Lord *Brooke*, in a discourse of nature of Episcopacie, *cap.5. pag.6.*

world) lyeth in our understandings, and the darkenesse thereof—— but there is none in the things themselves, or actions, which are still either unlawfull or necessarie. And this is most true in actions morall and humane. The Church putteth indifferencie on nothing, there a necessitie in respect of our darknesse, many be scandalized at things which seeme not necessarie to them, yet are they in *re*, in themselves necessarie. But conformists object, *That the very will of the Church*, Act. 15. *made things indifferent before the act now to become necessarie, if then the Church may take away indifferencie, she may give also.* But I answer, The *antecedent* is most false, *Junius, Calvin, Beza, Bullinger, Brentius, Pomeranus, Marloret*, and the text clearly saith, by the law of Nature these were scandalous. So (*b*) *Origen* thinketh to *eat blood was scandalous.* And (*c*) *Strabo* saith, *the heathen in their sacrifice dranke blood*; Yea, (*d*) saith *Tertullian*, the heathen dranke mens blood, and (*e*) *Augustine* saith, *they forbade these for a time in the case of scandall, that the ancient Synogogue might be buried with honour*; Yea, (*f*) *Irenæus*, (*g*) *Tertullian*, and (*h*) *Cyprian* will have these drawne to a spirituall sense, that they should abstaine from Idolatrie, shedding of blood and fornication; And (*i*) the Jesuit *Lorinus* saith this was a positive Law, which without the case of scandall, doeth not strictly abolish. (*k*) *Cajetanus, Fornication by Gods law was forbidden, the other things in the Canon were forbidden to gratifie the Jews.* (*l*) *Philippus Gamethæus* a *Sorbonist* saith, *they were forbidden to nourish concord betwixt Jew and Gentile, for the infirmitie of the Jewes.* 2. That the will of the Councell made them not necessarie, whereas before the act they were indifferent, is cleare. 1. It had then been needlesse to discusse the matter by Scripture. 2. To alledge the holy Ghost as author of the Synod; It seemed good to the *Holy Ghost, &c.* if the bare will of men had made them necessarie.

But saith (*m*) *Paybodie, Any good thing may become an occasion of evill by accident, and through our fault; the Word condemneth not occasions of ill by accident, but such only as are*

(*b*) *Origen cont. celsum*, l. 8.
(*c*) *Strabo*, l. 15.
(*d*) *Tertull.* in Apol. ca 9. *bibebant sanguinem humanum.*
(*e*) *August.* epist 19. *Ut vetus Synagoge hoc pacto cum honore sepaliretur.*
(*f*) *Irenæus*, lib. 2 cap 12.
(*g*) *Tertullian de pudicit*, c. 12.
(*h*) *Cyprian ad Quirinum*, l. 7.
(*i*) *Lorinus com. in act* 15 *ait esse legem mere positivam, quæ remoto, contemptu scandalo & alio peccato, non videtur arctè obligare.*
(*k*) *Cajetan, vitare fornicationem est divini juris, reliqua in Canone erant ut morem gererent iis Judæis quibus conviverent.* (*l*) *Philip. Gamieth* in 1. q. 104. 105 ca. 2. *ad fovendum inter Judæos & Gentes mutuam concordiam propter infirmitatem Judæorum.* (*m*) *Paybodie*, par. 3 pag 413. 414.

occasions

occasions of evill, and in themselves evill things, indifferent are not in themselves evill.

Ans. All occasions whether ill in themselves or indifferent, are occasions of sinne by accident, and through our fault, who abuse them, but all occasions because occasions, and not because evill are forbidden, when as they are not necessarie, and this is Gods argument to prove that the *Jewes* are not to marry with the Canaanites, *for* (saith the law) *they will turne away your heart, after their Gods*, to send abroad a goaring oxe, to seeke his food, hath no sinne in it, save only it may occasion the killing of men; and the building of houses without battlements, *and the going by the doore of the whoore, or comming neere her house*, are not of themselves ill, but only forbidden under this reduplication, because they are occasions of ill: sinnes, as sinnes are forbidden, and as occasions of sinnes, they are also new sinnes, having a distinct illegalitie and guiltinesse in them, from this that they occasion sinne: and Gods law (as all Divines teach) forbiddeth sinne, and all occasions of sinne. Drunkennesse is both forbidden as intemperancie, and also as an occasion of lust, and of speaking perverse things, as is evident, *Pro.* 23.33. For then the spirit of Gods argument were null to dissuade from drunkennesse, as he doth in these words, *Thine eye shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things.* Now we can shew that many wayes Ceremonies occasion sinne, as 1. they trimme and decore a Church for harlot lovers, from *Rome*, forbidden, *Jer.* 2.33. *Suarez*, *Franciscus de sancta clara*, *Gretserus*, and other Papists, for these, were in love with the Church of *England*. 2. They occasion dissention in Gods house, and are contrary to peace, *Ps.* 34.14. *Heb.* 12.19. *Rom.* 12.18. and so to be rejected. 3. They beare false witnesse of Poperie, which we disclaime. 4. They are against the spirituall worshiping of God, and lead us backe to the carnall commandements, and beggerly rudiments of the law, from the Gospell, against the word of God, *Joh* 4.24. *Gal.* 4.9,10. *Heb.* 7.16. *Heb.* 9.8.9. *Gal.* 3.25.26. *Gal.* 4.1.2. *Coll.* 2.20. They are torches in day light, and vaine and useleſſe. 5. They bring us under bondage to men, contrary to the Apostle, *Col.* 2.20. *and to the ordinances of men, and under the power of things,*

1 *Cor.* 6.12

1 *Cor.*6.12. 6. They are against our Christian libertie. They answer, especially (*a*) *Paybodie*, and (*b*) D. *Forbes*, *that Christian libertie is not restrained by doing, or not doing a thing indifferent, for so there should be no lawes made at all by the Church, concerning things indifferent, but Christian libertie not hurt, if* 1. *the Ceremonies be free to the conscience, and not made necessarie.* 2. *If they be not made necessarie to salvation.* 3. *If they be holden alterable by mans authoritie.* *Ans.* The question is perverted, for we question not if the use of things indifferent lay a bond on Christian libertie, but if the will of authoritie can make a law of things indifferent; when there is no intrinsecall necessitie in the things themselves, when necessitie of edification layeth on a tye, Christian libertie is not indeed restrained, for *God* then layeth on a bond. 2. Externall eating of meats, and observing of dayes, is a part of the libertie, wherewith *Christ* hath made us free, *Coll.*2.21. *Eat not, touch not, taste not*, men eat not meat with their minde or conscience, but with the teeth of their body, and to such externall eating, *men are dead with Christ*, as touching externall observation thereof, and *Paul*, Gal.2.19. *as dead to the Law, living to God, and crucified with Christ*, is freed from such *Judaizing*, as *Peter* fell into, but that *Judaizing* did not bind *Peters* conscience, neither was it repute of him, as necessarie to salvation, as he had taught, *Act.*10. And the false *Apostles* pressed Circumcision, not, as tying the conscience, or as necessarie for salvation, but *Gal.*6.12. μόνον ἵνα μὴ--διώκωνται, *&c.* only, *that they may not suffer affliction for the crosse of Christ*, and yet to be circumcised externally without necessitie of conscience before *God*, crossed directly *the libertie wherewith Christ had made them free*, Gal. 5.1. and 1 *Cor.*9. *Have we not power to lead about a wife, and sister aswell as others?* Yet if the Prelates at *Corinth* should have made an act, forbidding Church-men to marry, though they had esteemed not marrying, both free to the conscience, and also not necessarie to salvation, they had laid bands upon *Pauls* libertie. 3. We see not how the Ceremonies are left free to the conscience, because they are alterable by the Church, for the reason of kneeling to bread, of humane dayes, of Surplice, is morall, not Nationall; there is no reason why prophaning of the Lords Supper, should not be

(*a*) *Paybodie.*
(*b*) *D. Forbes in Irenico.*

eschewed, in all the world, and at all times, as in *Britaine*, and at this time; and Crossing and Surplice doth signifie dedication to *Christs* service, and Pastorall holinesse in all the world, as in *Britaine*, and therefore they cannot be nationall rites and alterable, but must be universall, and at all times, and in all places doctrinall. 4. The very externall Washings, Feasts, New-Moones, Offerings, though they should be thought free toward the conscience, are externall burdens against Christian libertie, as our Divines, (a) *Calvin*, (b) *Chemnitius*, (c) *Polanus* teacheth, and (d) *Bellarmine* answereth, *the places alledged speaketh of Jewish servitude.* But our Divines especially (e) *Junius* and (f) *Whittakerus* answer *Bellarmine*, that *Paul*, Coll. 2. *speaketh against all Commandements of men*, yea, *hee speaketh against Angel-worship, which is not a Jewish shadow, whereof Christ is the bodie.* But they say it is a wide rule, *that all things that may be wanting in Gods worship, are to be omitted in the case of scandall.* I answer, there be three sort of things here considerable. 1. Things not commanded of *God*, as all religious observances, these are utterly unlawfull, when the using of them scandalizeth. 2. Things that fall under an affirmative precept, and these cannot be totally omitted, for eschewing scandall: for whatever *God* hath commanded is some way necessarie: *Ergo*, it some-wayes, and in some cases, may be done, though offence be taken at it, but branches, or parts of affirmative precepts may be omitted, for eschewing of scandall, as such a particular kneeling in prayer, in such a place: but Gods affirmatiue precepts leave not off to be alwayes scandalous actively, though information be given, *for where the use hurteth, the abuse and scandall is not taken away by teaching*; to teach how Images should not be abused, make not Images to leave off to be scandalous objects. 3. There bee some things of meere civill use, as Bells, Gownes, Pulpits, preaching on Tuesday or Thursday. These be considered two wayes. 1 As necessarie with *necessitie of conveniencie simply.* 2. With necessitie of conveniencie, *secundum prevalentiam graduum*, as convenient in the highest degree of necessitie, or that morall, *maximum quod sit*, in the first degree, what scandalizeth, is to be rejected; in the last respect they oblige, and if any be scandalized thereat, it is taken

(a) *Calvin Inst.* l. 3. c. 19. sect. 7. *tertia (pars libertatis) ut nulla rerum externarum quæ per se sunt, ἀδιάφορα, religione coram Deo tangeremur quin eas nunc usurpare, nunc indifferenter liceat uti.*

(b) *Chemnit.* Exam. part. 2. *de rit. sacra.* p. 33.

(c) *Polan. Syntag Theol.* lib 6. c. 2. 9.

(d) *Bell. de offic. ac Sacram.* l. 2 c. 2. 32.

(e) *Iunius in Bell.* co. 3. l. 4. c. 2 17. n. 19 20

(f) *Whittaker de pontif. Rom.* q. 7. c. 3. ad 5.

and

and not given. It may be the Church sees not alwayes the higheſt and superlative conveniencie, in theſe Physicall circumstances, but they oblige not becauſe of the Churches authoritie, no more then the word of *God* borroweth authority from the *Church*, but they have an intrinsecall neceſſitie in themselves, though right reason in the *Church* see not alwayes this neceſſitie, therefore that a signe be given for convening the people, that the Preacher officiate in the moſt grave and convenient habite is neceſſarie, *Jure divino, by Gods law*, and that tolling of Bells, and a Gowne, a Pulpit bee as particulars moſt convenient for theſe ends, the Church Miniſterially doth judge, ſo as the obligatorie power is from the things themſelves, not from the will of humane Superiours. No neceſſitie of peace which is poſterior to truth, no neceſſitie of obedience to authoritie, no neceſſitie of uniformitie in theſe externals, simply, and as they are ſuch, are neceſſities obliging us to obedience: for things muſt first in themselves be neceſſarie, before they can oblige to obedience. I muſt obey Superiouss in theſe things of convenient neceſſitie, becauſe they are convenient, and moſt convenient in themselves, and ſo intrinsecally moſt neceſſarie, but they are not neceſſarily to be done in themselves, becauſe I muſt obey Superiours, and becauſe I muſt keep uniformitie with the *Church*. The will of Superiours doe find in things neceſſitie, and good of uniformitie, but they doe not make neceſſitie, nor the good of uniformitie: We ſhould be ſervants of men, if our obedience were *ultimatè* reſolved, in the meere will of Superiours, in any the leaſt circumſtance of worſhip: and what I ſay of actions, holdeth in matters of meere cuſtome alſo.

But Maſter *Sanderſon*, D. *Forbes*, M. *Paybodie*, *teach that we are not to regard the ſcandall of the malitious, as of Phariſees.* To which I anſwer, We are to have alike regard, in caſe of ſcandall, to wicked and malitious, as to weake and infirme. For we are not to regard the paſſive ſcandall of the weake more nor of the wicked, for who ever ſtumble at the neceſſarie ordinances of *God*, they take a ſcandall, which is not culpably given. But that we are to regard the active ſcandall of all, even the moſt malitious, I demonſtrate thus, 1 *Rom.* 14. 15. *Paul* proveth that we are not to ſcandalize our brother, 1. becauſe it

is againſt charitie. 2. Becauſe we are not to deſtroy him, for whom *Chriſt* died: but we owe love to the malitious, even to our enemies, and muſt not walke uncharitably toward him, as the law of *God* requireth. 3. A malitious man is one for whom Chriſt died, very often, as is cleare in *Paul* before his converſion.

2. 1 *Cor.* 10, 32. *Wherefore give no ſcandall, neither to the Jewes, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God.* 33. *Even as I pleaſe all men, in all things, not ſeeking mine owne profit, but the profit of many, that they may be ſaved.* Here be many arguments for our purpoſe, *All men*; whether weake or wilfull, are either *Jewes* or *Gentiles*, and none more malitious againſt *Paul*, and the *Goſpell*, then the *Jewes*, yet muſt we take heed that we give them no ſcandall.

Fran. Silvius Duacenſ. Profeſ. in 22. q. 43. a. 7. concl. 3. Charitas dicat ne abſque omni cauſa offeramus proximo, etiam ex' malitia peccaturo, occaſionem peccati. Ita Tannerus, in 22. to. 3 diſ. 1. q 6 duc. 9. aſſer. 3 bene conquedam lebia elevandis ad vitandum ſcandalum malitioſorum.

3. If we muſt pleaſe all men, in all things indifferent, *Ergo*, alſo malitious men. 4. If we muſt ſeeke the profit not of our ſelves, but of all men, and ſeeke to ſave them, and ſo ſeeke the ſalvation even of the malitious, as *Chriſt* prayed for his malitious enemies, ſo muſt we not ſcandalize them. 5. I argue from the nature of ſcandall, ſcandall is ſpirituall murther, but the ſixt Commandement forbiddeth murthering of any man, either weake or wilfull; for *no murtherer can have life eternall*, 1 *Joh.* 3, 15. Now weakneſſe or malice in the ſcandalized is accidentall to the nature of ſcandall active, for active ſcandalizing is to doe inordinately and unſeaſonably, that which *hic & nunc* may be omitted; from which any is ſcandalized, either weake or wilfull, to lay a ſnare to kill a wicked man (except it be, by the authoritie of him, who beareth the ſword under *God*) is murther, no leſſe then to kill an innocent man. 6. To ſcandalize actively, is to be acceſſarie to the ſinne of the partie ſcandalized, but we may not be acceſſarie to the ſinne of either wilfull, wicked, or weake, for it is againſt the petitions, that we are taught to pray, *Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdome come, Thy will be done, in earth, as it is in heaven.* They love not the comming and enlargement of Chriſts kingdome, who doe not, what they can to hinder ſinne, farre leſſe is *Gods* honour their care, who doe that unneceſſarily, by which any may fall in ſin. 7. It is againſt the gentleneſſe required in Preachers, and by

proportion

proportion required in all, who are with patience to wait upon *these who oppose the truth, if God peradventure will give them repentance, to the acknowledgement of the truth. 2 Tim. 2. 24. 25.*

8. It is contrary to the example of *Christ*, and his Apostles, who as the learned (a) *Parker* saith, eschewed the active scandalizing of the malitious, *Christ payed tribute, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν, lest we should scandalize the malitious Pharisees*, for it could not but of malice be taken by *Pharisees*, who sought nothing more then to bring *Christ* within the compasse of disloyaltie to *Cæsar*.

(a) *Parker* on the crosse, *part* 2. *sect.* 8 *Matth.* 17. 27.

Quest. VI.

A further consideration of things not necessary, and how they be scandalous objects.

1. Dist.

Some things are necessarie physically, as to eat flesh, and some things are necessarie morally, either because of a law of nature, or a positive or divine command. 2. Dist.

Of the necessitie of things which remove scandall.

The same way, Some things are not necessarie physically, and that either simply, as wee may live simply without some rare meats, that our Land and soyle doth not afford, or in some respect only, as without such and such flesh forbidden by the law of God. Or things are not necessary Morally or Theologically, as to eat forbidden meats befor a weake Jew.

3. Dist.

Some things Physically necessarie, as to eat fleshes being apt to nourish my body, may be Morally or Theologically not necessarie, being stambling blocks to my weak brother.

4. Dist.

Some things may be necessarie, in specie, and that morally, as to heare the Word, to Pray. But, in individuo, clothed with such and such circumstances may be not necessarie, as to goe to heare the Word, when my brothers house is on fire, that hearing is not necessarie, but may be scandalous, and the like we may say of praying in the streets.

5. Dist.

Some things may be necessarie Physically in private, as to eat for health some fleshes, which publickly before weake Jews, as the case was Rom. 14. *is* Morally *not necessarie, but scandalous.*

6. Distinct.

Some things necessary from the only positive will of God, Some things necessarie from some thing in the things themselves.

Some things are not necessarie, because of the mere positive will of God. As the temple of Baal, and therefore was to be destroyed, not for the abuse of it. for a house has alwayes some necessary use to man now in the state of sin. And of this kind were the cattell of the Amalakites, *which were as necessarie of themselves for food, and sacrifice as other cattell. and the Babylonish garment, and wedge of Gold, to which* Achan's *slimie hands did cleave, and therefore ehey were not necessarie, but to be abstained from by* Saul *and the* Israelites *because of the sole positive command of God, Other things are not necessarie, both because God forbiddeth them and because of the scandal and sinfull consequences, that are possible to fall out, as for Gods people to marry with the idolatrous* Canaanites, *was not necessarie, both because Gods forbidden will made it not necessarie morally, and also because they might draw away Gods people to serve their Gods, which was a feazable, and a very possible snare, thought some idolatresses being married to the* Jews, *might have been drawne from their idolatrie, and gained to the faith of the God of Israel.*

Two sorts of monuments of idolatrie.

1. *Concl. Monuments*, or instruments of idolatrie, are of two sorts, either such things as have no other use at all, but to contribute some subservient influence in, or unto idolatrous worship, and because these have all their warrant from a meere commandement of man, they are simply not necessarie, as the graven image, the idols themselves, all positive observances in *Gods* worship destitute of any command of *God*, and the use of these in any case must be scandalous, and so unlawfull, because, if the *Brazen Serpent* now losing its primitive divine effect, which was to cure the stinged people, if it be but the passive object of robbing *God* of his glorie, in that Incense is burnt to it, have no use at all, but to be, as it were, a robbers Den to receive the stolne-away glory of *God*, it must be abolished. It is true things necessary abused in regard of our corruption, are to be purged, and restored to their own use, but if

they be useleſſe, and of themſelves have no fruite, but only, that they are fit to be abuſed, as uſeleſs pittes by the way ſide, and the *Brazen Serpent*, and a Razor put in the hand of a childe, and images, they are to be removed, both *ſubject* and *accident*, for that they be uncapible of purgation, therefore they are capable only of abolition. It is not enough *to ſay that wee may deviſe a good uſe for them, as we may uſe Images to put us in remembrance of God*, for we may never deviſe the uſe of a thing not neceſſarie in Religion, when as we cannot deviſe the thing it ſelfe. But here we cannot deviſe the thing it ſelfe. Yea, if the thing it ſelfe be good, and lawfully uſefull. As the eating of fleſh, yet if it be leſſe neceſſary, for the life, then the edification of my brother. The Apoſtles excellent rule, *Rom.* 14. *v.* 15. muſt ſtand as a law diſcharging my eating. *No man for this or this meat, which is leſſe neceſſarie, ought to hinder the ſalvation of his brother, which is more neceſſarie, by deſtroying his brother for meat.* For cleare it is, this or that meat, without which I may live, is of farre leſſe neceſſitie comparatively, then the ſalvation of one for whom *Chriſt* died. True it is alſo, if my brother be ſcandalized, and ſo his ſoule in hazard, if I eat any at all, in that caſe, the ſcandall is meerly paſſive, for though my brothers ſalvation be of greater conſequent and neceſſitie then my temporal life, yet my totall abſtinence from meat is a killing of my ſelfe and heynous murther, and ſo forbidden in the ſixt Commandement, and ſo a deſtroying of my own ſoule. And eating for conſcience ſake is neceſſarie, though eating of this or this meat be not neceſſary.

We cannot deviſe the uſe of any thing in worſhip, when we cannot deviſe the thing it ſelfe.

But there be other things that are inſtruments of idolatrie and ſubſervient thereunto, in a Common and Phyſicall influence, as a *Temple builded* to the honour of a Saint, and for the adoring of Images, and for the reading and opening the word of God in the *New and old Teſtament*, though in a corrupt way, theſe are not properly monuments of Idolatrie. Now the houſe or *Church*, as ſuch is no monument, nor uſeleſſe inſtrument in worſhip, ſuch as is a Surplice, a humane holy day, for it hath, as ſuch, being a thing of walls and timber, no other, then that very ſame phyſicall *influence in* worſhipping either the true *God*, or a *Saint*, that it hath in civill uſe, in our ordinarie

ordinarie dwelling, to wit, to fence our bodies, in religious, in naturall, in civill actions, from injuries of heaven, clouds, and ſin. The adjuncts of the Church, as *Crucifixes, Images, Altars, Ravels, Maſſe-clothes*, and the like, are properly Monuments, and inſtruments of Idolatrie, becauſe theſe are not neceſſary, as is the materiall houſe, nor have they any common and phyſicall influence in the worſhip, as the Temple hath, yea all the neceſſitie or influence that they have in the worſhip, is only religious and humane flowing from the will of men, without either neceſſitie from our naturall Conſtitution of body, or any word of Scripture, and therfore they are to be removed upon this ground, becauſe they are unneceſſarie ſnares to Idolatrie.

Object. *This particular Temple or houſe builded for Saint* Peter, S. Paul, *S.* Cutbert *is not neceſſarie for the worſhip of* God, *becauſe other houſes of as convenient uſe, and neceſſitie may be had, for the worſhip of* God, *and this particular houſe ought to be demoliſhed, as* Jehu 2 King. 10. 27. *deſtroyed the houſe of* Baal, *and made it a draught-houſe, as the law ſaith expreſly*, Deut. 7. 25. *The graven Images of their Gods, ſhall yee burne with fire, thou ſhalt not deſire the ſilver or gold that (is on) them, nor take it unto thee, leſt thou be ſnared therein: for it is an abomination unto the Lord thy God.* v. 26. *Neither ſhalt thou bring an abomination unto thy houſe, leſt thou be a curſed thing like it, but thou ſhalt utterly deteſt it, and thou ſhalt utterly abhorre it, for it is a curſed thing. Or at leaſt theſe Churches may be imployed for ſome other uſe, then for the worſhip of God, where they may bee ſnares.*

The place Deut. 7. 25. *The graven image of their Gods ſhall ye burne with fire* declared.

Anſ. 1. We are carefully to diſtinguiſh betweene a law of Nature, or a perpetuall binding Morall law, which ſtandeth for an eternall rule to us, except the *Law-giver* himſelfe by a ſupervenient poſitive law, which ſerveth but for a time, doe looſe us from an obligation thereunto, and a poſitive temporarie law. *God* ſaith in an expreſſe law of nature, that obligeth us perpetually (*The ſonne ſhall not be put to death for the ſins of the father*) no *Magiſtrate* on earth can lawfully take away the life of the ſon, for the ſin of the father; for this eternally obligeth. Yet *Saul* was to deſtroy the ſucking children of the *Amalekites* for the ſinnes of their fathers, but he had a poſitive temporarie commandof *God* to warrant his fact. 1 *Sam.* 15. 2. 3

none

none can inferre that we are from this law, which was a particular exception, from a Catholick perpetually obliging morall law, that *Magistrates* are now to take away the lives of the sucking infants of Papists. So this is perpetuall and morall, and warranteth us for ever to use all the creatures of God for our use. 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. *Gen.* 1. 27. 28. then we may lawfully use Gold, Silver, Houses, all creatures for meats, except some particular positive law, or some providentiall emergent necessitie forbid us, as the Ceremoniall lawes of the *Jewes* forbidding the eating of swines flesh, and some other meats, were no other thing, but Divine positive exceptions from the law of nature and creation, in the which God had created swines flesh, and all these other forbidden meats for the use of *Man*, and so by the same reason, *God* hath ordained Church and houses to fence off us the injuries of *Sunne* and *Aire*, in all our actions civill and religious, except that by a peculiar Precept, he forbid the use of the *house of Baal*, to the *Jewes*, to be a typicall teaching to us of *Gods* hating of *Idols* and *Idolatrie*, but not of our demolishing and making useless all houses builded to the honour of *Idols* and *Saints* under the *New Testament*, except wee had the like Commandement that the *Jewes* had.

How houses and Temples builded to Saints are not to be demolished.

These who oppose us, in this, can no more inhibite us by any law of God, of the use of a creature granted to us by the law of the creation, then they can interdyte us of the use of another creature, nor are we more warranted to demolish Temples and materiall houses which have only a physicall and common use alike in all our actions, Naturall, civill, and Ecclesiasticall or Religious, then of eating swines flesh, or of other meats forbidden in the *Ceremonial Law*, and to answer to the Argument, *this or that materiall house builded to the honour of* Paul *and* Peter *is every way* as necessarie in the worship of God, as a Temple builded of purpose for the worship of God, though another house may conduce as much for the worshipping of *God*, as this, yea it hath the same very necessarie Use, and Physicall conveniencie, for the serving of *God*, that any other house hath, which was never builded for the honour of a *Saint*, which I prove. 1. Because no creature of *God* that is usefull to us, by the law of creation, is capable of any morall contagion to make it

Temples and houses have a like physicall use in Gods worship, as out of Gods worship.

unlawfull to us, but from the meer will of *God*, as the Gold and Silver, and Idol-houses of the false Gods, and *Images of Canaan* are intrinsecally, and by the Law of creation, as pure, and morally clean, as the Gold and Silver and *Synagogues* of the *Jewes*, and had their Physicall and civill necessitie, the one, as the other had. But from whence was it that the *Jewes* might make use of their owne *Silver* and *Gold*, and *houses*, and not of the houses, or silver and gold of the heathen *Gods* and *Idols*? Certainly this was from *Gods* meer positive will and command; forbidding the *Gold* and houses of the *Idols* of *Canaan*, and not forbidding the other, the Adversaries can give no other reason: therefore they must give us the same positive Commandement, for not making use of the *Gold* and Silver, and Temples of the *Popish Idols*, and *Saints* under the *New Testament*, that the *Iewes* had for refusing the Gold and Silver, and demolishing the Temples of the heathenish Idols of *Canaan*. And if they say, *That*
Deut.7.25,26. *the very command that warranted the Iewes to abstaine from the use of the heathens Gold and Idol-temples, doth warrant us to abstaine from the use of the Gold and Idol-temples of Papists.* It is answered, we have no warrant from the Word, but it shall warrant us as well to abstaine from swines flesh; if it be replyed, *every creature of God eatable is Good, and may be received lawfully.* 1 *Tim.*4.6. *Rom* 14.14. I answer, so all gold, all silver, all houses serving to fence off the injuries of heaven, and aire, are good, and fit for *Mans* use, and now blessed in *Christ* under the *New Testament*, except you say, that it is not lawfull to make use of the Gold and Silver of a *Popish Image*, nor of trees of the Papists *fields that beareth no fruit*, for these also were discharged to the *Iewes*. *Deut.* 20. *v.* 19 20. and the reason why they *might not cut downe the trees, that beareth fruit*, was, because these trees were mans life, *Deuter.*20 19. whereas trees that beare no fruit were to be cut down, as not so necessarie for mans life. Now this reason is morall and perpetuall, and so are houses to fence off the injuries of the clouds a *Mans life*; except they bee forbidden by a positive law of *God*, and so necessarie as without the use of houses no worshipping of God can be ordinarily; And therefore in the second place, as we use *Gold, Silver, Temples*, and materiall houses (though abused to Idolatrie) because

becauſe the Lord hath created them for our uſe, his law of Creation warranting us to uſe them, ſo can we not refraine from the uſe of them, though abuſed by *Papiſts*, except wee have a ſpeciall poſitive law to warrant us to refraine from the uſe of theſe neceſſarie creatures of *God*, ſo uſefull for the life of man; For according to the grounds of theſe againſt whom we now diſpute, the Garments of ſilke or cloth of Gold, that hath covered *Popiſh Images*, the *Gold* and *Silver* of the *Popiſh Images*, though melted and diſſolved into innocent mettall, the Materiall Temples builded to the honour of *Saints*, are to be caſt away and utterly aboliſhed, as unlawfull to be uſed in any ſort, for the *Jewes* according to the Law, *Deut.* 7. 19. 20. might make no uſe of the gold or ſilver of the *Heathen-Image*, and *Achan* brought a curſe on himſelfe, for the ſimple taking for his uſe, *the wedge of Gold, and the Babiloniſh Garment.* Now we have no law in the *New Teſtament* to abandon the uſe of the creatures, for as *Cornelius* was not *to count that meat uncleane, which God had clenſed*, Act 10. 15. So neither are we to count Silver and Gold, and houſes uſeleſſe, which *God* in the Creation made Good, and uſefull for our life, and therefore no morall contagion can adhere ſo to theſe creatures, as we are utterly to diſuſe them, as creatures curſed, becauſe they were abuſed, except it can be proved that the abuſe of them hath deprived us of the neceſſarie uſe, that they have by the law of Creation; for certaine it is, as the killing of the ſucking infants of the *Amalakites* was typicall, and tyeth not us to kill the young children of *Papiſts*, ſo was the diſuſing, or not uſing of Gold, Silver and Houſes, abuſed to Idolatrie, typicall.

No Houſes, no Temple, no creatures, are now uncleane uner the New Teſtament.

Deut. 12. 1, 2.

And before I come to the ſecond Concluſion, An houſe for the worſhip of *God* is amongſt the things that are neceſſarie, by way of diſjunction, *in ſpecie*, not in *individuo*; that is, a houſe is neceſſarie, in its Phyſicall uſe, to fence off our bodies, the injuries of Sunne, Aire, and heaven, but not this houſe, for another houſe may ſerve the turne as conveniently. But ſome obiect, *Then this, or this houſe Dedicated ſuperſtitiouſly to the religious honour of a Saint ought to be removed out of the worſhip of God. I becauſe by your owne confeſſion. This individuall houſe ſo abuſed is not neceſſarie.* God *may well be worſhipped, without this*

How things not neceſſarie are to bee abſtained from, or uſed, in the caſe of Scandall.

this house, though it never had been, in rerum naturâ. 2. *From the worshipping of* God *in so Superstitious a place, many truly godly are so scandalized, that for worshipping* God *in such Superstitious and Idolatrous places, they have Separated from your Church, conceiving that in so doing you heale the wounds of the Beast; It is true, it may be their weakneſſe, yea but be it so, that it were their wickedneſs, that they are scandalized, yet by your doctrine, in things not necessarie you are not to doe any thing by which either the weake, or the wicked may be scandalized; as is cleare in the eating of meats,* Rom. 14.

Anſ. This argument may 1. be retorted against these who hold with us the same doctrine of *Scandal,* for, without eating of Swines flesh, my life may be preserved, and a malitious *Iew* may be, and necessarily is highly scandalized, that I, who possibly am a *Iew* converted to the Christian faith, doe eat Swines flesh before him, for he conceiveth me to be an Apostate from *Moses his law,* therefore I should abstaine from eating Swines flesh before a *Iew,* who out of Malice is scandalized, by my doing a thing not necessarie *hic & nunc.* But the conclusion is absurd: nor doe I think that many truly godly of the Strictest Separation doe stumble at our Churches out of wickednesse. Many truly Godly and Sincere refuse to come to our *Churches,* whereas many scandalous, well lustered hypocrites, who knoweth nothing of the power of godlinesse, but are sitten downe in the Scorners Chaire are admitted to the Lords Supper, and as the former cannot be excused, so I pray *God,* that the latter draw not downe the wrath of *God* upon both Kingdomes. 2. Things not necessarie which actively produce scandall must not be only indifferent *Physically* in their naturall use, as This or this house, but they must be indifferent both *Physically* and *Morally,* for the Meats spoken of, *Rom.* 14. at that time, were both wayes indifferent. 1. They were not necessary but indifferent *Physically* in an ordinarie providence, both then and now, for ordinarily my life may be preserved, and suffer little losse by not eating Swines flesh, or such meats, in case of extreame necessitie of sterving, if any could have no other meat, they might eat then, as the case was, *Rem.* 14. becauſe *Mercie is better then Sacrifice* at alltimes. 2. These things *Rom.* 14. were indifferent

Theologically

Theologically or *Morally* in their owne nature, 1.*v.*3. *Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not: and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath received him.* 2. Because *v.*17. *The kingdome of God is not meat and drink.* Sure, in *Moses* his time, to abstaine from such meats, and eat such, as the *Lambe of the Passeover*, the *Manna*, to *drinke of the water of the Rock*, was worship, and so some part of the *kingdome of heaven*, but it is not so now, saith *Paul.* 3 *Paul* clearly maketh them *Morally* indifferent. 1 *Cor.*8.8 *But meat commendeth us not to God, for neither if we eat, are wee better* (morally and before *God*) *neither if we eat not, are wee* (*Morally*) *the worse.* Now this *Temple* or *House Physically* is indifferent, and not necessarie for the worship of *God*, for men may be defended from the injuries of *Sunne* and *aire*, Though this house had never been *in rerum naturâ*. But this Temple or house though dedicated to a Saint is not Morally indifferent. but Morally necessarie, so as if you remove it from the worship, because abused to Idolatrie, and give it in no use in the defending of our bodies from the injuries of the *Wind*, *Raine and Sunne*, you *Iudaize*, and doe actively scandalize the *Iewes*, and harden them in their Apostasie, and so this house though abused to *Idolatrie*, is not indifferent *Morally*, as the meats *Rom.*14. But the using of it is necessarie, and an asserting of our Christian libertie, as to eat blood, and things strangled, and Swines flesh even before a *Iew*, so to use all houses for a physicall end to defend our bodies from heat and cold, is a part of the libertie wherewith *Christ hath made us free.* But Ceremonies have no naturall and physicall use. The crossing of the aire with the Thumbe, the keeping of a day religiously without warrant of the Word, are not taught in the Schoole of Nature, and so are naturally not necessarie as This or this house, though abused to Superstition is, and the Adversaries that say they are *Morally* indifferent, as good, and as Spirituall Ceremonies in kind and nature, may be devised in their place. But in all this dispute of Scandall, we give, but doe never grant that the Ceremonies are indifferent, wee dispute here that they are scandalous, and so unlawfull in their use, upon the principles of *Formalists*; whereas we judge them in their nature, because they

they have not *God*, but the will of men to be their father and author, to be unlawfull, and repugnant to Scripture, becauſe not warranted by either command, practice, or promiſe in Scripture.

2. *Concluſ.* *Concluſ.* 2. As ſome things Phyſically neceſſarie muſt be abſtained from, when the unſeaſonable uſing of them is a ſtumbling block to our weak brother, in the caſe of the morall indifferencie of the thing, as it was in the eating, or not eating of meats once forbidden by *Gods* law, but then indifferent. *Rom.* 14.14. 1 *Cor.* 8.8. for then it was true, (*But meat commendeth us not to God, for neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not, are we the worſe.*) So in the caſe of phyſicall indifferencie, but of Moral and Theologicall neceſſitie, when an Evangelike law of Chriſtian libertie has paſſed a determination upon eating, or not eating; Then to abſtaine from eating upon a pretended feare of not offending a weak *Iew*, is actively to lay a ſinfull ſtumbling-block before a weak *Iew*, and to harden him in *Iudaiſme*, and here uſing of ſuch meats, and the affirmative, to wit, to eat is lawfull and neceſſarie, the things being now morally neceſſarie, not morally indifferent, where as before the negative, to wit, not to eat was lawfull and neceſſarie. Hence to eat, *Rom* 14. 1 *Cor.* 8. before a weak *Iew*, was unlawfull and *an active ſcandall*, the eating or not eating then of the owne nature being morally indifferent, and to abſtaine from eating before a weak Jew, *Col.* 2.16.17. *Gal.* 2. *v.* 5.11.12. *Gal.* 5.1.2.3. is unlawfull and an active ſcandall, becauſe now eating is morally neceſſarie, and a *ſtanding in*, and an aſſerting of the *libertie wherewith Chriſt has made us free*. And upon the ſame ground, for the *Iewes*, when the Ceremoniall law ſtood in vigor, to make uſe of *Baals Temple*, for a *Synagogue* to the worſhip of the true *God*, was unlawfull and againſt a *Ceremonial* Command of *God*, as was the ſacrificing of the *Amalakites* cattell to the Lord, and the uſing of the ſilver and Gold of the *Canaanites* Idols, *Deut.* 7.25,26. 1 *Sam.* 15.1,2,3. But when theſe things forbidden were in the caſe of morall indifferencie, as were certaine meats, *Rom.* 14. 1 *Cor.* 8. and *c.* 10. they were not unlawfull, by reaſon of any ſuch Ceremoniall poſitive Commandement, only by the unſeaſonable uſing of them,

before

before weak *Iewes*, they were scandalous; but these same *Idols* houses, Silver and Gold now, when we are fully possessed *in that libertie wherewith Christ has made us free*, Are so to be used as the good creatures of *God* given to both *Iew* and *Gentile* now under the Gospell, by the ancient Law of creation, that now to abstaine from the use of houses, Gold and Silver abused to idolatrie and worshipping of either *Popish Saints* or *Idols*, and the *Idols* of *Pagans*, upon any pretence of a Ceremonial Command, were to *Iudaize*, and to betray our Christian libertie, and the highest scandalizing and hardening of the *Iewes*. For that is a mere Ceremonial Commandement which depriveth us of the use of things or creatures, that are naturally usefull to us, such as are houses, cattell, silver, and *Gold*, upon the meere will of the supreame law-giver; And upon this ground to disuse Churches builded to *Saints* by *Papists*, is *Iudaizing*, for the thing is not morally indifferent, as meats were in the case *Rom.* 14. 1 *Cor.* *c.* 8. *c.* 10. but the use is morally necessarie for the asserting of Christian libertie; Christ having made every creature of God good in its native use, for man, both Houses, and Gold and Silver, as all meats are 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. 5. *Genes.* 1. 28. 29. and having *made all things new*, Revel. 21. 5. and given us a new spirituall right to them, 1 *Cor.* 3. *v.* 21. 22. 23. and therefore to take them from us, by any Ceremoniall law, is to put us againe under the old yoake, from which we are freed through *Iesus Christ*, Acts 15. *v.* 10. 11. And the houses, and Gold and Silver, though abused to *Idolatrie*, doe now returne to their physicall uses, of which the *Iewes*, by a temporarie positive law, were interdyted, for the time of their infancie, yea, if we were interdyted of any creature of *God*, by such a law we might not eat of oxen and sheepe, that had belonged to *Papists*, who are *Idolaters*, for *Saul* was never to use the Cattell of the *Amalakites* for common use, nor for food, nor for sacrifices to the *Lord*: And it should bee unlawfull to melt the *Silver-Images* of *Papists*, and convert them into money, for the poore, or turne them into silver bowls or cups, for the lawfull use of the Lords Supper. I grant to sell *Images* of Gold or Silver to these who use them, as formall Idols is unlawfull; as to sell a whore for money to these that should professe the buying of her for harlotrie, were to be accessarie

acceſſarie to that harlotrie, eſpecially ſeeing Idols formally remaining ſo are, *ex naturâ rei*, for no other end, but for *Idolatrie*; they have no neceſſarie phyſicall uſe for the life of man, farre more, if they be the portraictures *of the Father, Sonne, or holy Spirit*, if they be of ſtone, or of any thing, that cannot be uſefull for mans life, then muſt they be defaced and broken, leſt we lay the ſtumbling block *of our iniquitie before others*. Now, if from any law of the *Iewes*, or practiſe of *Moſes*, and *Ezechiah*, houſes builded to the honour of Saints, Silver and Gold of Idols, were to be made uſeleſſe, in their phyſicall uſe, in the worſhip of God, or for our civill uſe, then were we, upon that ground, to diſſolve the ſtones and timber of ſuch a houſe, and to bray and ſtampe the Silver and Gold into powder, as theſe holy Rulers did. People here fleeing from *Antichriſt*, fall evidently in *Iudaiſme*, and make themſelves, with the *Galathians*, debtors to Circumciſion, and all the Ceremonies of *Moſes*, which thing we condemne in the *Anti-Chriſt*.

Obiect. *If we muſt abſtaine from the uſe of no creature granted to us, by the law of creation, except we have the warrant of a poſitive Ceremoniall law for it; then the Romans were not to forbeare eating of ſuch and ſuch meats, before a weake Iew, for feare to ſcandalize him for whom Chriſt died, But this later is untrue: for by the law of nature, and a perpetuall law,* Paul *would never, for meat, offend his brother: the law of naturall Charitie will dictate this to us, without any poſitive mandate, we are not for a mouthfull of meat, the loſſe whereof is ſo ſmall, to put the ſoule of our brother to ſo incomparable a hazard, as to be loſed.*

Anſ. Theſe meats, *Rom.* 14. and 1 *Cor.* 8 10. were then indifferent, but they are not ſo now, when the Goſpell is fully promulgate, for we may not now to abſtaine from Meats forbidden in the *Ceremonial* law, for feare to offend a weake *Iew*, for our abſtinence ſhould harden them in their unbeliefe, that *Chriſt is not yet come in the fleſh*. To make *Temples* and houſes dedicated to *Saints*, as indifferent now as meats were then, and the argument were concludent; But to demoliſh Churches, and remove their phyſicall uſe now were as *Iudaicall*, as to forbeare to eat Swines fleſh. We are not to deprive our ſelves of the phyſicall uſe of any creature, as of this, or this meat, as thinking

we

we are bound by any law of *God* to forbeare the use thereof, and especially we are not to doe it, as conceiving we are under the tye of a law given to the *Iewes*, whereas we are under no such tye, or law, at all. But the disusing of *Temples* dedicated to *Saints*, that the Adversaries plead for, *Deut.7.* is a totall renouncing of all use of them; & the places they alledge from the Ceremoniall law doth conclude it: for the *Temples*, silver and gold of the *Idols of Canaan* were altogether useless to *Israel*. It was *Achan*'s sinne, that he tooke the *Babilonish garment, and the wedge of Gold*; for any use civill or religious, though he should have bestowed these for any religious use, or the relieve of the poore and indigent: yea, though it was scandalous to none, he having taken these privately and by theft, yet the very taking of them was a curse to him, and the whole *Camp of Israel*, for the totall abandoning of all use whatsoever of these houses, Gold and Silver, which in themselves, and by the law of Creation were physicall, and in regard of that naturall use they had from their Creator to supply our necessitie, can have its rise from no other totall and compleat cause, but from the sole positive will of *God*, discharging his people of the whole use of these creatures at all, as if they had never been created for the use of man, whether their use should be scandalous to others, or not scandalous. But by the law of nature, which, I grant, saith (*Thou shalt not scandalize nor murther the soule of him, for whom Christ hath died.*) The *Romans*, Rom. 14. and the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 8 were forbidden the eating of fleshes forbidden in *Moses* law. But with these two restrictions 1. they were forbidden not all eating of these meats in private, but only in the presence of a weak *Iew*, and for the conscience of others, in the case of scandal, 1 *Cor* 10 28,29. (2) They were not by the law of nature that inhibites scandall, forbidden the totall use of these meats, in any case, so as they should make these meats utterly useless to themselves, or to any others. As the *Iewes* were forbidden to make use of the *Canaanitish Idols*, Gold and money: And of the Cattell of the *Amalekites*, either secretly or openly, either in the case of scandall given to others, or not given. And *Achan* payed deare for *his Babilonish garment, and his wedge of Gold*, though he tooke it by theft.

Things scandalous under the N. Testament are forbidden in a farre; other sense, then meats, dayes and other things in the Ceremoniall law.

Ob.2. *But the reaſon of the law, is the ſoule of the law. Now the reaſon of the Law* Deut.7.25. *why God forbade his people to take the Gold or Silver of the graven image, is leſt thou be enſnared therein. But this reaſon holdeth under the New Teſtament, and is moral and perpetuall. The very materiall houſe dedicated to Saints and Idols, by Papiſts, is a ſnare to our ſoules; if we ſhall worſhip* God *in them, or if we ſhall name the Church from* Cutbert, Giles, *or the like, except we would ſay, as Papiſts doe, that we are not now, under the New Teſtament, ſo much enclined to Idolatrie, as the people of the Iewes were of old.*

How far a morall and perpetuall reaſon maketh a law perpetuall.

Anſ. The halfe-reaſon or incompleat morall ground of the law is not the ſoule of the law: But you muſt take in all the reaſons, the words of the text are theſe. *Thou ſhalt not deſire the ſilver and gold that is on them, nor take it to thee, leſt thou be inſnared therein: for it is an abomination unto the Lord thy God. v.26. Neither ſhalt thou bring an abomination into thine houſe, leſt thou be a curſed thing like it.* Now what made that Gold an abomination to the Lord, more then all the gold of the earth? it is of it ſelfe the good and uſefull creature of *God*, no leſſe then all the gold of the earth: nothing made it *an abomination to God*, but, if we look to the originall cauſe, there was a poſitive, free command of God forbidding Iſrael to covet, or uſe that Gold. The *Canaanites* themſelves, by the law of nature might lawfully have melted that ſame very Gold, and made uſe of it, without ſinne. 2. It is not a good reaſon, *Such a law had a morall and perpetuall reaſon.* Ergo, *the law it ſelfe is perpetuall and morall.* It followeth only: Ergo, *the moralitie of that law is perpetuall.* For all the Ceremoniall laws had a morall and perpetuall reaſon: As the ſhadows had a moral ſubſtantiall ground in *Chriſt* the bodie of all ſhadowes: but it doth not follow therefore the ſhadows and Ceremoniall law in the letter muſt bee perpetuall: Very often in the booke of *Leviticus*, there is no reaſon given of the Ceremoniall laws. But, *be ye holy, I am the Lord, that ſanctifies you.* This is a morall and perpetuall reaſon, that endureth to the end of the world, yet it is no due conſequence: therefore all theſe ſhadowes and Ceremonies ſhall indure to the end of the world, The reaſon is, becauſe it is the ſole poſitive will of God that maketh a temporarie concatena-

*Levit.*ch.11.

tion between not eating blood, and not being cruell, and between sacrificing and being holy, and yet not being cruel is perpetuall, not eating blood temporarie. (3) If things indifferent, as the eating of flesh, before a weak *Jew*, Rom. 14. be a snare to my owne soule and to the soules of others: I am to abstaine from these and the like. But that I must abstaine from the totall use of any creature that God has made usefull for the life of man, by the law of creation, as *Israel* was to abstaine from the cattell of the *Amalakites*, and to stamp in powder, and make altogether useless the Gold and Silver of the heathen *Idol-Gods*, is altogether unlawfull, and a very Judaizing, and its to make, as *Paul* saith, *Jesus Christ* of no effect.

Object. 3. *But at least we are to abstaine, for scandalls sake, from worshipping the true* God, *in these Temples, and houses abused to idolatrie, lest we lay a stumbling-block before others, even as the* Romans *and* Corinthians *were to abstaine from meats, before such weake* Jews, *as conceived these meats to be unlawfull; seeing the losse of such meats, and abstinence, for a time, was nothing comparable to the losse of one soule for whom Christ died, so the losing of the use of a materiall house in a religious use, so it be imployed to some civill use, and be not totally lost, is nothing comparable to the scandalizing and insnaring of the soules, both of Jewes and weake Christians, which will certainly follow, if we use Temples dedicated to Saints, in Gods worship.*

Ans. It is true, the losse of the use of a materiall Temple, is nothing comparable to active scandall, which is the destroying of any soule. But the refusing to worship God in these materiall *Temples*, because abused to Idolatrie, were not only a disusing of the creature, without any warrant from *God*, but an open *Judaizing*, and an active scandall both to *Jewes* and *Christians*, though we should imploy the houses to civill use., for any externall conformitie with the *Iewes*, when the thing is not indifferent, in religious acts, such as is the disusing of the Churches is *Iudaising*: for should we now use *Circumcision* and the *Passover* with an open, printed and professed intention to signifie *Christ* already come in the flesh, and should make an open declaration against the *Jewish* intention in these ordinances; we should no lesse *Iudaize*, then *Peter*, who *Gal.* 2. did

Disusing of houses because abused to idolatrie, a Iudaising.

did only practise an externall conformitie with the *Iewes*, with no *Iewish* intention, sure he was perswaded that *Christ* was already come in the flesh: yet was he justly rebuked, by *Paul*, for *Iudaizing*. For the losse of an house in a materiall or physicall use of it, I grant it is not comparable to the losse of a Son. But the losing of it on a religious ground, is another thing. When the religious losse of the house is not indifferent, as was the Abstinence from some meats indifferent then, but sinfully scandalous before a weak brother.

Ob. 4. *But if the worshipping of the true God in these materiall temples, be no lesse an ensnaring of us in popish Idolatrie, then the using of the Gold and Silver of the Canaanites Idols, then we are to disuse all worshipping of God in these houses, as well as they were: But the former is true, for we may be no lesse insnared with materiall houses, then they.*

Ans. I deny the major Proposition, for the eating of blood, the taking of both the young bird, and the damme in the nest, was an insnaring of the *Iewes* to crueltie, through their abuse of the creatures, the use whereof *God*, had made both lawfull and necessarie to them in the Creation. The blood was the life of the beast, and the *Lord* requireth in us *mercie, to our beasts life, whereas the tender mercies of the wicked are cruell*, Prov. 12. 10. yet is it not lawfull for us to devise any way, we please, to keepe us from being snared in crueltie, for then upon the same ground, it were unlawfull for us to eat blood, contrary to the expresse word of *God*, *Rom.* 14 14. 1 *Cor.* 10. 25, 26. 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. 4. *God* by a positive and Ceremoniall Command hedged in the people of the *Iewes*, from being insnared in Idolatrie, and, by some Ceremonies, taught them to detest all *Idolatrie*: but it doth not follow, that we *Christians* are to inure our hearts, from being insnared with *Idols*, and to a detestation of Idolatrie, by these same Ceremonies that they were commanded, for then we were obliged to *stampe* the Golden and Silver idols, *to dust and powder*: and to *cast the powder into the river* as *Moses* did the *Golden Calfe*, Deut. 9. 21. and behoved to drinke of that water, *Exod.* 32. 20. 1 *Chro.* 15. 16. 2 *King.* 18 4. so it followeth no wayes, though the physicall use of a materiall *Temple*, should insnare us to Idolatrie, that we are therefore to disuse that house;

except

except we had the same Ceremoniall command to warrant us, that the *Jewes* had, and by this argument, you may bring us backe to observe all the *Ceremonies* of *Moses* his law, Because all these *Ceremonies* were appointed in the wisdome of *God*, either to keepe us from being insnared in some sinne, and to raise, in our heart, a detestation thereof, or to teach us somewhat of *Christ*, of whom we be naturally ignorant and forgetfull.

Ob. 5. *But at your first reformation of the Church of* Scotland, *your Reformers, such as M.* Knox, *and others, demolished most of the faireſt Churches in that Land, and for no other reason, but because they had been nests of popish idolatrie.*

Ans. That *Churches* in so farre as their use extendeth, farther then to the commodious propulsation of injuries of *Sunne and Aire*, be demolished, we can well allow, for these that were demolished by our *Reformers* of blessed memorie; nor so spacious and inconvenient for hearing the word of God and celebration of the Sacraments, being ordained for *Masses*, *Idols*, for blind superstition, that the very length, breadth, height, beauty, and glory of them might redound to the glory of *Saints* and *Idols*, that it was reason they should be demolished in so farre as they conduced nothing for the physicall and necessarie end, for which *Churches* are ordained under the *New Testament*; And thus farre we allow of the breaking of *Images*, *Crosses*, *Crucifixes*, and all *Monuments of Idolatrie*, so as the matter of all these, whether Timber, Marble stones, Mettall of Gold, Silver, Brasse, or the like to be imployed, for the necessarie use of mans life, but that all their superstitious forme and religious use be utterly abolished. As for the abolishing of Bels abused in time of *Poperie*; because they have a necessarie and Physicall use to give warning for the seasonable conveneing of the people of *God*, to the publick worship, I see no ground for it, from *Deut.* 7. or other places, but we must be necessitate to stampe to powder the very Mettall of Bels, and to render them not only useleſſe in Churches, but any other way tending to the good of mans life.

Bells for the convening of the people to publick worship not to be abolished, though they have been abused to superstition.

Object. *But* Num. 31. 21, 22. *rayment and skins, and vessels of wood taken from Midian, though taken as spoyle, were purified, and the Gold and silver, brasse, yron, &c. were purified by fire,*

and not made useleſſe, ſo the Churches dedicated to Mary, Peter, *and to Angels, and Saints, are not to be made useleſſe, they may be imployed for the poore to dwell in but they can have no religious use in the worſhip of God, except we would heale the wounde of the daughter of Babel.*

Anſ. I deny not but *Churches* dedicated to *Saints*, and in regard of their vaine and oſtentive ſpaciouſneſſe unprofitable for hearing the Word, may be imployed to civill uſes for ordinarie dwelling; But I ſee no ground how this can be according to the places cited by our godly Brethren of the contrary minde except the *Churches* were firſt purified, in ſome *Ceremonial* way, as *God* preſcribeth that the ſpoyle of *Midian* be purified, which our Brethren cannot ſay, except we would make our ſelves debtors to the whole Law, for ſo the law was, *Num.* 31. and ſo *Paul* doth reject Circumciſion, *Gal.* 5. 3. and if it be ſaid the neceſſitie of the poore requireth that theſe Temples be not looſed, but imployed for the poore, as *David* in point of neceſſitie eat the Shew-bread. I anſwer 1. The poore, as the caſe was, *Rom.* 14. might eat Swines-fleſh, and ſo ruine him; for whom *Chriſt* died, which is abſurd, for their neceſſitie might require it. But certaine it is, *Davids* neceſſitie was layd on him by the ſixt Commandement as an act of mercie in the point of ſtarving, and if any poore *Iew* were in the like caſe, I conceive it ſhould have been ſcandalizing to that *Jew* to eat Swines-fleſh, before another weake *Iew*. Providentiall neceſſitie may make that which is a ſinfull ſcandalizing to bee obedience to the ſixt Commandement, but the will of Superiours can make no ſuch providentiall change as the *D. of Aberdeene* doe dreame. But if the neceſſitie bee leſſe then the Neceſſitie in point of ſterving, it could juſtifie the poore *Iewes* eating of meats conceived to be againſt the law of *God*, as the caſe was, *Rom.* 14. But that the Church or houſe dedicated to a Saint, ſhould have no phyſicall uſe in the worſhip of *God* to defend us from the injuries of *Sunne* and *Heaven*, and yet have the ſame uſe, in common, for the poore to dwell in, wanteth all ſhadow of reaſon, for how can it be proven that the ſame phyſicall uſe in the worſhip is unlawfull, and yet out of worſhip is lawfull? except there intervene ſome Ceremoniall and religious purging of the

houſe,

house, by fire or some other way, which were Iudaical under the *New Testament*, for the necessity of the poor, is not like the necessity of *Davids eating of Shew-bread:* Its certain, that the necesity of disusing the creature in a Physical usage, in the worship, must have a warrant in Scripture, as well as the using of the same, in the same usage, must have the like warrant.

Object. 5. *But Bels are more hurtful to the souls of Gods people, who are scandalized by them, then they are useful for the tymous and seasonable convening of the people, and therefore they may well be abolished, being lesse necessary, and necessary onely* ad melius esse, *for the better ordering of the Worship of God, and not simply necessary for the being of the Worship. Now as the Lord our God will have a lesser necessity to yeeld to any greater, a bodily necessity to give place to a soul-necessity (the soul being more excellent then the body) as is clear in that God would have his people to dispence with the lesser losse of the spoyl of the Amalakites of their Idols, gold and silver, that the greater necessity may stand, to wit, their not being allured, nor their teeth put a watering, and their heart to a lusting after the Idols of* Canaan; *so would he have us to abolish the Saints Temples, the gold of Popish Images, the Bels that are lesse necessary (seeing the Sun may teach as well as the Bell) for eschewing soul-dangers in laying stumbling blocks, both before our own souls, and others.*

Answ. 1. It is denyed, that Bells which have a necessary use, though onely for the better ordering of the worship of God, are any active objects of scandal, and the meer passive scandal taken at any thing not indifferent, but physically necessary, and so necessary, that without it sinful inconvenients of either wearying in the service of God, or sinful neglect should follow, is no sinful scandal given, but meerly taken.

2. There be two necessities of things, one natural, and first in that regard, another religious, and in that regard secondary; the former necessity doth alwayes stand, except God remove it by some posteriour commandment. Its necessary, that *Adam* and *Evah* eat of all things that God created for eating. God (I grant) may remove this necessity in some, and command either *Adam* to fast for a time, or not *to eat of the tree of Knowledge:* So say I, warning by Bells hath a physical necessity, the use of the Temples in worshipping hath the like necessity, so have Gold and Silver a necessity.

neceſſity. God onely, either by a Commandment, or by an exigence of providence that ſtandeth to us (as in the caſe of a ſcandal) for a command can remove the phyſical neceſſity, and inhibite *Iſrael* to uſe ſuch and ſuch Gold, as have been in uſe in the Heathen Idols, and may forbid to perform an act of obedience to an affirmative command in the caſe of ſcandal, as he may forbid *Paul* to take wages for Preaching the Goſpel, though *Paul* have ſome natural neceſſity of taking wages. But the Church without a higher warrant from God, hath no power to reſtrain us in the neceſſary uſe that God hath given us. Make Bells and Temples as indifferent and unneceſſary as ſome meats were, *Rom.* 14. and I ſhall yeeld the Argument.

3. That the *Lord our God will have a bodily neceſsity as the ſmaller, to yeeld to a ſoul-neceſſity as the greater*, is a ground not ſo ſure, but it ought to have been proved, except by a ſoul-neceſſity, you mean a neceſſity of ſaving the ſoul, and not ſinning againſt God, and oppoſe it to a meer bodily neceſſity, including no ſin in it, then I ſhall grant the Aſſertion, *That the one neceſſity is greater then the other.* But otherwiſe, *Cæteris paribus*, other things being alike, I conceive it is contradicted by Ieſus Chriſts ſaying, *Matth.* 12. cited out of *Hoſea*, Chap. 6. *I will have mercy, and not ſacrifice*: And here we muſt determine the caſe of ſcandal to the ſoul from the exſuperance of neceſſity to the body and life. The caſe falleth out, *David* and his followers are at the point of ſtarving for hunger (it may be a queſtion if the preſent neceſſity be ſo great) there being no bread for them, but the Shew-bread, which by a Ceremonial Law of God, onely the Prieſts ſhould eat: If any of the followers of *David* out of a groundleſſe ſcrupuloſity of conſcience ſhould have taken *Pauls* Argument, *Rom.* 14. and ſaid to *David*, *I will ſtarve rather ere I eat this bread; for a divine law forbids me; and if thou eat of it, it ſhall be a ſcandal to me, and wilt thou for bread deſtroy him for whom Chriſt died? The Apoſtle* Paul *would not, for ſo ſmal a thing, as to eat ſwines fleſh before a weak Jew, in the caſe*, Rom. 14. *deſtroy the ſoul of one for whom Chriſt died, by laying before him a ſtumbling block, by his unſeaſonable and ſcandalous eating.* I think (if Scripture cannot poſſibly be contrary to Scripture) this doubt might eaſily be removed, by anſwering the caſe was

not

not alike with *David* in his hunger, and so in a Physicall and naturall necessitie to save his owne temporall life, that by all probabilitie was in great danger, and these who being in no such necessitie, did eat such meats scandalous, and so distructive to the soules of weake ones, and having varietie of other meats to keep them from sterving, and so a meere necessitie of preserving the bodily life, if we compare one affirmative command of God, with another, may remove that which may be supposed a *soule necessitie*. And the reason is, because in the doctrine of scandall, which is more intricate and obscure then every Divine conceives, *God placeth acts of providentiall necessitie as emergent significations of his approving will, which are so to us, in place of a divine Commandement of Gods revealed will, and these providentiall acts of necessitie doe no lesse oblige us to morall obedience, then any of the expresse written Commandements of God.* I cleare it thus. There is an expresse law. *It is sin and unlawfull for* David, *or any man, who is not one of the Lords Priests, to eat shew-bread.* But *God* commeth in, and putteth *David* in such a posture of divine providence, that if he eat not *shew-bread*, he shall be sinfully guiltie of violating a higher morall law of *God*, who saith, *I will have mercie and not sacrifice*. Then *David* shall be cruell to his owne life, and sinne against the sixt Commandement. *Thou shalt doe no murther*. If he eat not, for not to eat, when you are in a *providentiall condition* of sterving, if you may have it, is to kill your selfe, and this *providentiall condition* doth no lesse oblige you to the Morall obedience of the sixt Command, then if *God* in the letter of the Law should command you to eat. This fact of *David* was not done by any extraordinarie impulsion of the *Spirit*, but by a constant chanell that *Providence* ordinarily runneth in, according to which I, or any Professor must be obliged to preferre a worke of *Mercie to Sacrifice*, that is, by which we are to give obedience to the sixt Command, which is not to kill, even as without extraordinarie impulsion, I may absent my selfe from hearing the Word, when I find going to *Church* may indanger my life, for non-obedience to affirmatives, in a greater necessitie, is ordinarie. And therefore *Christian* prudence, with which the *Wisdome of God keeps house*, Prov. 8. 12. doth determine

A most necessarie rule to be observed in the doctrine of scandall, that emergent providences of naturall necessitie are to us in place of divine commands, in some cases.

many things of ſcandall: And prudence is a vertue commanded in the word of *God*, for *a wiſe man obſerves times*, and ſo will he obſerve all other circumſtances, yet there be rules here which ſtandeth alwayes, and they be theſe. 1. *Comparing a phyſicall and meerely naturall neceſſitie with a morall neceſſitie, if we yeeld to the phyſicall neceſſitie, and neglect the moral, we ſinne againſt God, and may lay a ſtumbling blocke before others*; as to eat ſuch meats, where the loſſe is ſmall, and the neceſſitie of eating meerely phyſicall, and the eating be a ſcandall to the weake, we ſinne and give ſcandall, the caſe is cleare, *Rom.* 14. for eating, (the caſe being indifferent, as it was, *Rom.* 14.) is a meere phyſicall neceſſitie, and not ſcandalizing a weake brother, is a morall neceſſitie. 2. *Rule, if we compare a greater morall neceſſitie with a leſſe morall neceſſitie, the leſſe neceſſitie muſt yeeld to the greater*, a neceſſitie of mercie muſt yeeld to a neceſſitie of *ſacrificeing*; if *David* then ſhould not have eaten the ſhew-bread, in his providentiall neceſſitie of famine, he ſhould have been guiltie both of active ſcandalizing the ſoules of others in killing himſelfe, and ſhould have killed himſelfe, and the leſſe morall neceſſitie ceaſeth, and is no neceſſitie, when a greater moral neceſſitie interveneth. 3. *Rule. Where there is a phyſicall neceſſitie of the thing, yet not extreame, and a morall neceſſitie of abſtinence, we are to abſtaine*; The *Jewes* had a phyſicall neceſſitie of the *Babyloniſh Garments*, but not ſo extreame, in point of periſhing, through cold, as *David* had of Shew-bread, in point of ſterving for famine, therefore *Achan* ſhould have obeyed the morall neceſſitie of not *touching the accurſed thing*, and neglected the phyſicall neceſſitie, which if it had amounted to the degrees of neceſſitie of *mercie*, rather then obeying a *Ceremoniall Command*, ſuch as was (*Touch not the accurſed ſpoyle*) *Achan* might, without ſinne or ſcandall, to himſelfe or others, have medled with the ſpoyle. 4. *Rule. That which is neceſſarie*, in ſpecie, *in the kind, as to goe to Church and heare the Word, to come to the houſe of God and Worſhip, may be*, in individuo, *in a particular exigence of providence, not morally neceſſarie, but the contradicent thereof morally lawfull. David* doth lawfully forbeare to come to the *Lords houſe*, if he knew *Saul* may kill him, by the way. 5. *The things which we are to forbeare only for neceſ-*

Conſiderable rules touching the kindes and degrees of neceſſitie in eſchewing ſcandall.

1. *Rule.*

2. *Rule.*

3. *Rule.*

4. *Rule.*

5. *Rule.*

sitie of scandall, and upon no other ground, these I may doe in private, if I know they cannot come to the notice of these who shall be scandalized, upon the ground of lesse physicall necessitie; as *Rom.* 14. beleevers, for their necessitie ordinarie, and for nourishment, might eat fleshes in private, though before a weak *Jew* they could not, because the sinne is not in the act of eating, but wholly in the scandall, and in the manner of the unseasonable doing of it. *But these things which are morally not necessarie, because the substance of the fact is against a law we are to forbeare, both in private, because they are against a law, and in publick before others, for the scandall.* as *Achan* sinned in taking the *Babilonish Garment*, though in private, and his sinne should have been more scandalous, if he had done it publickly; Now these we are upon no ordinarie necessitie to doe, but such as may incroach upon the hazard of the losse of life, in which case an exigence of providence, does stand for a Command of non-murthering, had *Saul* and his Army been reduced to a danger of starving in a wildernesse, and could have no food, except they should kill, and eat the *Cattell of the Amalakites*, I conceive, The *Lords* preferring of *Mercie before Sacrifice*, should warrant them to eat of the *Amalakites* Cattell, yet would this providentiall necessitie be so limited, as it may fall out, that it stand not for a divine Command; for it holdeth in affirmative commands only, and 2. so positive as there must be, yea there can be no sin eligible by such and such a case, as *Lot* sinned in exposing his daughters to the lust of men, to redeeme abstinence from *Sodomie*.

Tannerus, to. 3. in 22 disp. 9. *de fide spe*, &c. q 6. dub. 9. *In magno casu necessitatis quæ valdè præponderat futuro scandalo, non est illictum facere rem habentem speciem mali, ut est simulatio Petri*, Gal. 2.

Turrian de virtu & vitiis, par. 1. c. 39. dubio 16. *Quando quis paratus est magnum furtum committere, non solum licitum est minus futilium consulere, sed etiam co-operari ad illud.*

Hence it is cleare, we may not doe a lesse, nor counsell another to commit a lesse sinne, to eschew a greater; as the *Jesuites* wickedly teach. So *Tannerus*, so *Turrianus* and others who make a *scandalum permissum*, a scandall that a *Christian* may hinder another to fall in, and yet he permitteth him to fall in it. But *God* hath a prerogative to permit sinfull scandals, men have no such power, when they are obliged to hinder it. The divinitie of others seemeth better to me, who deny that the least veniall should be committed to eschew a greater sinne.

6. Rule. There is a principle obligation, a lesse principle, a least principle. Hence these three degrees issue from love, 1. *God.* 2. *our* *6. Rule.*

2. *Our ſelves*, 3. *Our Neighbour*: *The love of God* is moſt principle, and is the meaſure of the love of our ſelves: the love of our ſelfe is leſſe principall, then the love of *God*, and ſo the obligation leſſe. I am to make away, life and all things, yea eternall glory as devided from holineſſe, and as it includeth only happineſſe, rather ere I ſinne againſt *God*. The obligation to care for my owne ſalvation, is more principall, then my obligation to care for the ſalvation of my Brother: for the love of my ſelfe is the meaſure and rule of the love of my Neighbour. Now becauſe the obligation of caring for the ſoule of my brother is only ſecondarie, in compare of the obligation of caring for my owne ſalvation, I am not to ſinne my ſelfe, or ſinfully to omit any thing that is commanded me in a poſitive precept, to prevent the ſinne of my brother. Yet hence it doth not follow, that a poſitive Precept is more excellent, then the law of Nature, which is (*Thou ſhalt not murther, nor ſcandalize him for whom Chriſt died.*) Becauſe though to care for the ſoule of my brother be of the law of nature *ſimpliciter*, yet is a ſecondarie obligation. and may ceaſe and yeeld, to a ſtronger obligation that tyeth me more principally to care, for my owne ſoule, for though the Command be poſitive, yet knowingly to ſinne, by a ſinfull omiſſion, is no leſſe a deſtroying of my owne ſoule, and ſo of the law of nature, in a higher obligation, then the other is.

7. Rule.

A ſcandal may flow from ignorance and corruption, and ſo be taken, when it alſo kindly iſſueth from the ſinfull or unſeaſonable fact of another, and ſo is alſo kindly given.

7. The *Jeſuits*, and *Popiſh* Doctors, as they are of a large conſcience in many things: ſo in the doctrine of ſcandall, to extoll obedience to men ſo high; as we may doe things in themſelves not neceſſarie, yea that hath no neceſſitie, but from the will of Commanders; And *Formaliſts* in this conſpire with them, even though from this doe flow the ruine of many ſoules: and though the ſinfull ſcandalizing and ruine of theſe ſoules, flow from ſinfull corruption of either ignorance or frailtie, or wilfulneſſe or malice, yet the ſcandall ceaſeth not to flow kindly from the pretended obedience to an unlawfull command; for the thing commanded having no Neceſſitie, but the will of man is unlawfull, and it is no good reaſon to ſay, Men are ſcandalized through their owne ignorance and Malice. *Ergo* the ſcandall is taken, and not given, for theſe who were enemies

mies to the Truth, and were so scandalized at *Davids* murthering of *Uriah*, and *Adulterie*, 2 *Sam.* 12. 14. as they were by him occasioned to blaspheme. Certaine their actuall scandall was from their owne corruption. But what? *Ergo*, it was not also from *Davids* murther and adulterie? and *ergo* it was a scandall only taken by the enemies, not given by *David*? Surely it followeth not. You may hence judge of the Rule of *Lodo Caspensis*, a *Capnecan*. *These* (saith he) *that doe a worke of it selfe indifferent, for a weightie cause, and use their owne right*, ut utantur suo jure, *are excused from mortall sinne, as these who lett a house to Whores, and publick Usurers, that are not strangers, though they may commodiously lett it to others, they doe not co-operate with sinne, because the house is but a place, and extrinsecall and remote to the sinne. So Christians taken by Turkes for danger of their life, (which is a weighty necessitie) may furnish instruments necessarie for warre against Christians, because they doe a worke indifferent of it selfe, for a just cause: so may a servant convey his Master to a Whore, yea and make the Bed for a Concubine, and open the doore, and if his Master be to climbe in at a window to a whore he may lift up his foot, or reach him a ladder.* Why? *the servant* (saith he) *useth his owne right in doing a worke of it selfe indifferent, Utitur suo jure, faciens opus ex se indifferens, modo non placeat ei peccatum.*

Caspensis, tom. 3. Curs Theolog. Trac. 27. de Charit. Sect. 2. disp. 8. num. 19.

A. But sure, all our *jus* and right that men have over their houses, and that Captives and servants have to their Masters and Lords, is *jus limitatum*, a right ruled, limited, bounded by the word of God, nor is the worke they performe *morally indifferent*, (physically it is) and Captive Christians, if for danger of their life, they may prepare necessary instruments of warre against *Christians*, they may kill *Christians* also: for what power the conquering *Lords* have over Captives to command them to prepare fire and sword, against the innocent witnesses of *Jesus Christ*, because they are such, the same *jus* right have they to command to kill the innocent. But for no cause the most weighty, can we choose either to shed innocent blood, or to co-operate with the shedding of it, nor to co-operate with the works of darknes, for it is shamefull that a servant *may lawfully co-operate with, and thrust his master in at a window, to goe*

A false rule of Papists, that men may co-operate a sinfull act, and be free of scandall because of some necessitie.

to a whore, the *jus* or dominion of *Maſters* to command, and the right of ſervants to obey is *only in the Lord*. Yea to kill a man is *Phyſically* indifferent, for that is phyſically, yea morally without relation to any law indifferent, which is capable of lawfulneſſe, or unlawfulneſſe, according as it ſhall bee commanded of, or forbidden by *God*. But for a man to kill his ſon, is of it ſelfe ſuch, certaine, if God command a Judge to kill his ſon, it is lawfull for the father to kill his ſon, if the Lord forbid *Abraham* to kill his ſon, it is unlawfull for *Abraham* to kill his ſon. And therefore *Caſpenſis* hath no more reaſon to uſe the Inſtance *of captives preparing warre againſt innocent Chriſtians, and of a ſervant thruſting his Maſter in at doore or windo to a whore*, then of captives killing the innocent, or of ſervants breaking a houſe, and taking away the goods of a man in the night, or of ſervants committing whoredome at the command of their *Conquerors* or *Lords*, the one kinde of action in it ſelfe is as indifferent and ſuſceptible of morall lawfulneſſe, and unlawfulneſſe, as the other. And if the *Maſter* doe co-operate to commit harlotrie in climbing in at a window to a whore, and to robbing, in digging thorow an innocent mans houſe in the night, to kill the Maſter of the houſe, and to ſteale his goods, then the ſervant that co-operateth in theſe ſame phyſicall actions, and alſo diggeth thorow the innocent mans houſe and kills himſelfe, is the harlot, and the robber, by co-operation and participation, no leſſe then the *Maſter*. The naked relation of a captive, and of a ſervant, cannot make the captive and ſervant innocent and guiltleſſe co-operators, for then to ſinne at the command of any Conqueror and Maſter, becauſe I am in the condition of a captive and ſervant, were lawfull, though *God* forbid and inhibite me to doe, what I doe, by the command of my Maſter and Conqueror, for in ſo doing, *Utor meo jure*, I uſe my right as a ſervant. For *God* forbiddeth me in what relation I be in, ſervant, or Captive, to ſinne, at the command of any, or for declining any ill of puniſhment, Though as weightie as the torment of hell ſeparated from ſinfull diſpairing and blaſpheming of *God*. Now to co-operate with that which I know to be a ſinne, is to partake in other mens ſinnes, which is forbidden, as a ſinne, 1 *Tim.*5.22. *Eph.*5.11. But to

No relation of ſervant or captive can render it lawfull to co-operate with ſin.

runne with the theefe, and to helpe an Arch-robber, *Prov.* 1. 13. 14. is a consenting to his robberie and bloodshed. And to help any to digge thorow a house, or to climbe in at a window to *Incest*, *Sodomie*, *Buggerie*, to fetch a beast to the Master who rageth in the sinne of Beastialitie, or to fetch a young man to the Master or Conqueror to the sinne of abominable *Sodomie*, knowing the Master and conquerors minde, is to co-operate to *Beastialitie* and *Sodomie*, is as high a measure of sinfull co-operating in these abominations, as for the servant to helpe up, or lift up his Master, to goe in, at a window to an harlot, for this is a consent to these sinnes, and a consent in the highest degree; so to give a knife to a Master, who seeketh it from his servant, to kill his Father, Mother, Prince, Pastor, is to consent formally to such horrible paricides, and therefore *Caspensis* should have brought instances in *Buggerie*, *Sodomie*, *Parricide*, when as *he used* softer Names of fornication and harlotrie.

8. The non-necessaries, or such things as need not be in the worship of *God*, which do bring scandall, Must 1. be such as are neither necessarie in *specie*, nor *in individuo*, in kind, or in spece or nature, or in their individuals and particulars, as the whole Categorie of Mens devises, as

8. *Rule.* What things non-necessarie are to be removed from the worship of God, as scandalous.

1 *Unwritten traditions* —— *not necessary, not written.*
2. *Humane mysticall, symbolical signes and Ceremonies* —— *not necessarie, not written.*
3. *Humane holy dayes, crossing, kneeling to Elements, Altars, Crossing, Surplice, Rochets*, &c, —— *not necessary, not written.*
4. *This and this humane holy day, this crossing* —— *not necessarie, not written.*

2. These things are judged not necessarie, that are not necessarie by way of dis-junction, as *Surplice* is not necessarie by way of dis-junction, for neither is Surplice necessarie, nor any other white or red habit, that hath some mysticall religious signification, like unto Surplice; So kneeling to the Elements is neither Necessarie, nor any the like religious honouring of them, by prostration before them, or kissing them.

Ceremonies not so much as necessarie by way of dis-junction, which necessitie agreeth to many circumstances of worship in the Directory.

But

But, the things of the Directorie for the publick worſhip, as many of them are neceſſarie, and have expreſſe warrant in the Word, as Praying, Preaching, Sacraments, Praiſing, &c. So 2. ſome things that are non-neceſſaries *in the individual or particular words*, or things, yet are they not to be removed in their alternative neceſſitie, either this or the like though ſome be therby ſcandalized. Becauſe though they be not neceſſarie ſimply, yet are they neceſſarie by way of diſ-junction, as that the *Miniſter* ſay, *either theſe, or the like words*, for words to that ſenſe are neceſſarie. So the order that the *Directorie* preſcribes in citing ſuch and ſuch acts of Divine worſhip is neceſſarie either this way, or a way as convenient not different from this, for ſome order of neceſſity there muſt be. So the *Liturgie or Service Booke*, what ever *Joſ. Hall* ſay on the contrary (as it is little that he doth, or can ſay) though it ſhould containe many things neceſſarie *in ſpecie*, in the kind, fit for the externall publick worſhipping of *God*, yet becauſe theſe words *in Individuo*, in their particulars are not neceſſarie, is to be removed, becauſe though all the matter were good (as much of it is *Popiſh*) yet that booke *in its ſtructure, frame, ſtyle, Grammer, methode*, and *forme* is *popiſh*, and framed after the model of the *Roman Miſſale*, eſpecially performed with the curſed Authoritie of the *Councell* of *Trent*, under *Pius the fift*, in all the *Maſſes*, *Rubricks*, *Epiſtles*, *Goſpels*, &c. is ſcandalous, and a *Directorie* in Scripture words is better, and is therefore juſtly layd aſide by the *Reverent Aſſemblie*, *and honourable Court of parliament*, becauſe there is ſcandall in words, in ſtyle and language, in divine worſhip. And theſe who will abſtaine from practiſing of ſome things in the *Directorie*, for feare of ſcandalizing others, muſt give reaſons from the Word that theſe things they forbeare, are neither neceſſarie ſimply, nor by way of diſ-junction. Becauſe as I conceive, Things neither neceſſarie in the *ſame individuals*, nor by *way of diſ-junction*, are ſuch *Non-neceſſaries* as are to be removed out of the worſhip of God, for feare of ſcandall. And that any ſuch non-neceſſaries can be found in the *Directorie*, I doe not ſee as yet.

Ob. *The people had the more opinion of Dietie in the thing they adored the baſer it was. None hath any ſuch opinion of the croſſe.*

Ergo.

Ergo, *it is no ſcandalous object.* *Anſ.* All our *Divines* hold, that *Heathens* of old, and *Papiſts* of late, worſhip *Images*, as religious memorative ſignes of *God*, *Hooker* with one daſh of his Pen, againſt the *Prophets* and *Scriptures*, acquiteth them of *Idolatrie*, therefore the Croſſe may be adored, without any opinion of *Dietie in it.*

Obj. *Be it true, that croſſes were purpoſely appointed to bee adored, yet not ſo now. The Jewes would not admit of the Image of* Cæſar *in the Church, yet they aboliſhed it not, but admitted it in their coyne. The adored croſs differeth as farre from this, as the Brazen Serpent that* Salomon *made to beare up the Ciſterne of the Temple, and that which Iſrael adored in the wilderneſs, And the Altars that* Joſiah *deſtroyed, as being meere Inſtruments of Idolatrie, and that which the Tribe of* Reuben *erected beyond* Jordan. Salomon *diſtroyed not the Temple and Idols framed only of purpoſe for the worſhip of forrains Gods, becauſe they ſtood now as forlorne, and did no harme.* Joſiah *afterward razed them for ſome inconvenients, yet God ſaith both theſe Kings, in religion, walked ſtraightly.* *Hooker.* *Ibid.*

Religious Monuments of Idolatrie are to be removed.

Anſ. 1. Though the *Croſs* were firſt framed for no adoration; yet we plead againſt the *Images* and *Croſſes* of *Lutherans* as not neceſſarie, in divine worſhip, and therefore to be removed, though never adored.

2. The people thinke *Baptiſme* incompleat without the *Croſſe*, *Ergo*, to them it has the like neceſſitie, as water.

3. How will *Hooker* proye never any burnt Incenſe to the *Brazen Serpent*, but beleeved it really to be *God*? that is his dreame, beſide the Text.

4. By this *Lutherans* have their deſire; for actuall intention that *Images be lawfull remembrancers of Chriſt*, without intention of adoration, ſhall make *Images* as lawfull teaching Ceremonies, as *Hooker* will have the ſigne of the Croſſe.

5. We remove not croſſes from coyne, no more then the *Jewes* did the image of *Cæſar*. But wee agree with them. *Hooker* being judge, in Baniſhing them from the worſhip.

6. *Ezechiah* then might have broken the old, and made a new *Brazen Serpent*, for a memoriall of the miraculous cure, ſo

they had not burnt Incense to it; The remembrance of the old mercie should have been as good in the new, as in the old. But certainly the *Brazen Serpent* was not destroyed as Brasse, but in all its religious use. It was not purged, but abolished.

Wolphius, who addeth to *P. Martyr*, Comment. in 2 King. 23. speaking of *Iosahs* zeale *Et hoc illius fides, & industria nos quoque excitabit, ut in odium & fastidium earum, quæ pugnant, cum Dei verbo, rerum, homines quoquo modo inducamus.*

7. If we may make *Images* and *Crosses* alike in shape, but dislike in use, in Gods worship, we may bring in *Golden Calves* to the *Temples*, and the Image of *Dagon*, and the *Sidonian Gods*, and *Altars* such as *Josiah* destroyed, so at their first moulding we imprint on them, chaste and innocent religious intentions and signification, and make them alike in shape, but dislike in use to heathen worship. But sure the *Calfe of Egypt*, and the *Calfe that Aaron* made, *though like in shape, yet were dislike in use.*

8. We read of no new Inconvenients that the *Images* and *Temples* that *Salomon* erected to strange Gods, did in *Josiahs* time, which they did not in *Exekiahs* time, but that they were Monuments of *Idolatrie* in both; It seemes that *Hooker* would commend *Ezechiah* for not demolishing the *Images* of *Salomons outlandish Gods*; But then it was *Josiahs* zeale without knowledge, that he demolished them. 2. We then might well suffer the Images of *Jupiter*, *Dagon*, *Ashtarosh* to stand before the people publickly, so they *doe no harme*: and *Papists* and *Lutherans* say *the Images of Christ and the Saints doe no harme*, when the *Pastors* carefully teach the people, that there is no *Dictie*, nor *God-head* dwelling in them. 3. Wee say the signe of the *Crosse* is a meere instrument of *Idolatrie* and Superstition, and what ever good intention, or pious signification was stamped on it, at the first, by mens carnall wisdome and will-zeale, it no more made it good, then if upon the Image of *Dagon*, you would found the like good intention and pious signification.

9. Though *Ezechiah* was commended by *God*, it no more followeth his omission in not demolishing *Salomons outlandish Idols must be lawfull, and a part of his upright walking in all matters of religion, then* because *David* is commended, as walking uprightly in all things, *save in the matter of* Uriah, that his *numbering of the people*, his revengefull attempt to destroy *Nabal* and all his, must also be a part of *Davids walking uprightly before God*.

10. *Salomon*

10. *Salomon* had a warrant for the *Brazen Image* in the *Temple*, not to aboliſh it. But *Ezechiah* had no warrant not to Aboliſh the *Brazen Serpent*, after the people burnt Incenſe to it, even ſuppoſe the *People* ſhould, opon the exhortation of the *Prieſts*, have deſiſted from burning Incenſe to it. I ſee not, if *Images* may be lawfull Remembrancers to us, ſo we adore them not; But the *Golden Calves*, the *Images* that *Salomon* made to *outlandiſh Gods*, the *Image of Diana*, and all the *heathen Images* that the Word ſpeaketh againſt ſhould be brought into the *Chriſtian Churches*, to teach us to flee, and eſchew the adoring of theſe abominations, for we have as great need of Ceremoniall and Hiſtoricall remembrancers to teach us to eſchew evill, as to admoniſh us to follow good. But the truth is, except we will be wiſer then *God*, we need neither.

Obj. *Some things are of their owne nature ſcandalous, and cannot chooſe but breed offence as thoſe ſinkes of execrable filth which* Joſiah *did turne out: Some things though not by nature generally, and of themſelves, are generally turned to evill through a corrupt habit growne, and uncurably ſettled in the mindes of men, without the removall of the thing, as was the worſhipping of the Brazen Serpent. But ſome, as the Croſſe though ſubject either almoſt, or altogether to as much corruption, are yet curable with more facilitie and eaſe.* Hooker Eccle. Policie, l. 5. 349 350. 2 King 23.7.

Anſ. Objects ſinfull and ſo intrinſecally ſcandalous are to be removed, as the *Image of Jupiter*, *Molech*, both becauſe ſins, and and ſo not neceſſarie. 2. Becauſe ſcandalous, for the truth is, even ſins (if we ſpeake accurately) are not ſcandalous *actu ſecundo*, in regard of our corruption, our ſinnes may ſad the *Angels*, but they are not properly ſcandalous to *Angels*, and therefore every thing actively ſcandalous, as ſcandalous is to be removed. 2. How doth *Hooker* prove that the *Veſſels made for* Baal, *are in their own nature more incurable then the ſigne of the Croſſe*? You may remove the *ſuperſtitious intention and Idolatrous* uſe of any veſſell, and turne it to a good uſe; Yet *Joſiah burnt them to aſhes*. The like may be ſaid of the Groves which he ſtamped to powder, and caſt in the brook *Kidron*, *And of the Chariots of the Sunne, which he burnt with fire*, and of the bones

bones of dead men, not any of these, being of their owne nature more indifferent, and innocent creatures of *God*, were of their owne nature more scandalous, and more uncurable then the *signe of the Crosse*. The like may be said of *Altars*, and I pray, are reasonable men, the Priests of the high places of their own nature uncurable? are they not capable of repentance, and curable by doctrine? yet 2 *King*. 23.20. *Josiah slew all the Priests of the high places*. 3. Teaching may remove evil customes, otherwise how should the *Gospell* convert sinners, that are accustomed from the wombe to doe evill? *Jer*. 13.23. *Jer*. 22.21. *Ephes*. 2.1.2.3.4. *Tit*. 3.3.4.5. therefore scandalous objects of the second kinde, are no more to be removed, then the *Signe of the Crosse*. 4. It is false, that scandalous objects of the third sort are more easily cured, except they be removed, for no humane prudence, when the signe of the *Crosse*, and the *Brasen serpent*, are sure, not necessarie in Gods worship. And when men have, and so still may abuse them to Superstition and Idolatrie, can make these being now actively scandalous, to be not actively scandalous, as no art can make a pite to be no pite. Indeed Gods ordinances, because necessarie, may bee cured, from scandall by teaching. But it is *Gods* only prerogative, by his commanding will to make a thing, not necessarie in his worship, to be necessarie, and to alter the nature of things, so as his command could have made the *Brazen Serpent*, to remaine a lawfull teaching Signe, and no scandalous object, and only he might have forbidden the burning of Incense to it. The Ancient *Ignatius*, or any had no warrant to make confession of Christ before enemies and mockers, by gestures or crossing, *Paul* did it not, *Peter* commandeth confession to be verball, 1 *Pet*. 3.14.15,

Hooker, 198. *There be many antient lawes, yea Divine and Apostolike constitutions acknowledged to be good, that the Church hath layd aside. Some things cannot be removed without danger of greater evils to succeed in their place. Wisedome must give place to necessitie.* Seneca, *Necessitas, quicquid coegit, defendit.*

Ans. 2. We know no necessitie to have, nor any danger to want such wares, as *Surplice*, *Crossing*, bowing to Altars, to elements, which sure the Apostolike Church wanted, both *in specie*,

speciè, and *in individuo*. The like Papists say for adoring of *Images*, that *Hooker* here saith, for *Surplice*, and the like Scandals. So doth the *Jesuit Tannerus* say, *in.* 22. *to.* 3, *dis.* 5. *de religione. q.* 2. *dub.* 3. *Quando dicitur Adorationem imaginum non esse licitam, quia non est scripta. Respo.* (*inquit*) *apostoli familiari Spiritus instinctu quædam Ecclesiis tradiderint Servanda quæ non reliquerunt in scriptis — inter hujusmodi Traditiones est Imaginum Christi adoratio.*

Quest. VII.

whether or no to use the indifferent Customes of heathen and Papists, in the worship of God, be scandalous.

WE are altogether of this mind, that a materiall Similitude between the true *Church* and the false, is not scandalous. Because *Rome* holdeth that there *is one God*, it followeth not, therefore it is unlawfull for us to hold there is one *God*. 2. There is a formall Similitude, as because the heathen kill their children to *Molech*, *ergo*, the *Children of Israel* should not *doe so to the Lord their God*. M. *Hooker* granteth there should be a dis-similitude betweene the true *Church* and *Heathens* in this, and *the Similitude* (say they) is unlawfull. But 3. the *Adversaries* draw us to a third dis-similitude betweene the true *Church*, and the *Popish*, and *heathenish Church*, and this is a mixt Similitude, that we should use indifferent Rites and Customes in Gods worship, as *Crossing*, *new devised dayes*, *Surplice &c.* which are used by *Papists*, and *Heathens*. This say our Adversaries, is not an unlawfull Similitude, yea with edification and profit (say they) we may thus farre conforme with them.

What Conformitie with Idolaters is unlawfull.

2. This conformitie doth gaine them, not Scandalize them, say they.

But we hold that this conformitie is unlawfull and a dissimilitude commanded.

1. *It is expresly said* Levit.18.3. *I am the Lord your God, after the doings of the Land of Egypt, wherein yee dwelt, shall yee not doe: And after the doings of the Land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not doe; Neither shall yee walke in their ordinances. 4. Ye shall doe my judgements, and keep mine ordinances, to walke therein, I am the Lord your God.* Hence if *God bee a God*, in a peculiar manner, in covenant with his *Church*, then may not his Church take a rule of worship, and walking from other prophane *Churches* and people, such as *Egypt*, *Canaan*, and *whorish Rome*. There is an Instance given in things of their owne nature indifferent, *Levit.*19. with the same Argument. 27. *Ye shall not round the corners of your heads; neither shalt thou marre the corners of thy Beard.* 28. *Yee shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, I am the Lord.* Certaine a greater scandall cannot be, then that those who are in *Covenant* with *God*, should borrow *significant Ceremonies* of sorrowing for the dead, *Levit.*19. 19. *Yee shall keepe my Statutes? Thou shalt not let thy cattell gender with divers kinde: Thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: Neither shall a garment mingled of linnen and wooll come upon thee.* Hence there is a cleare opposition made betweene *Gods* statutes. *Yee shall keepe my statutes, and the statutes of Canaan.* The *Canaanites* might weare Garments of linnen and wooll, and and sowe mingled seed. But *Deut.*22.9. *Thou* (the Israel of God) *shall not sowe thy Vineyard with divers seeds:* Why? *lest the fruit of the seed which thou hast sowen, and the fruit of thy vineyard be defiled.* The seed of the Nations was not defiled, though they did sowe mingled seed, *Ergo*, the Lord putteth some peculiar Character on his people, by this, to distinguish them from other *Nations* by giving these lawes to them, which did not oblige other *Nations*.

Conformitie with Idolaters in things, in Gods worship, not necessarie, unlawfull.

3. Wee make the *Papists* and the *Heathen* that have used white Garments, in the worship of *God*, and crossing in the Sacraments, and the like to be our fathers, where as wee are to disclaime them, and not to harden them so, as *Israel* did *Egypt*,

who

who said, *Yee cannot serve your God, except in our golden Calves*, by Gods argument *Levit.*19, *Israel*, and *Canaan*, Protestants, and Idolatrous *Papists* have one *God*, they have the same externall statutes,

4. What ever is a professed way of being infected and snared with the false religion of those who are at our doores, as *Egypt* and *Canaan* was to *Israel*; and *Papists* to us, must be scandalous conformitie with them, and this argument is cleare, *Levit.*18.3. *Yee shall not doe after the doings of the Land of Egypt, wherein yee dwell, nor after the doings of the Land of Canaan, whither I bring you*; *Ergo*, the danger is the greater, that we dwell beside *Idolaters*, and the publick practising of their rites, the more scandalous.

5. Wee sadden the spirits of the Godly, and lay a stumbling-block before the blind and weak, in that wee build *Jericho* again, and with our tongue we lick, and heale the *wound of the daughter of Babel*, where as with our teeth we should byte it.

6. Learned and godly *Cartwright*, the Author of the booke of Discipline; *Amesius* and others have cited *Councels*, as Concil.Braca.73. decreed, *That Christians should not deck their houses with Bay leaves, and greene boughs, that they should not keepe the first day of the moneth, because the Pagans did so.* And another Councell, *Concil. African.c.*27. forbade *Christians to Celebrate Feasts, on the Birth day of the Martyrs, because Pagans did so. Tertullian* would not have *Christians to sit after they had prayed, because Pagans did so.*

7. The mark and Character of the *Beast* is an externall discriminating note, of its owne nature, indifferent. Yet to receive it, is a matter of *Plagues* and wrath from *God*, Rev.13. 15 16. To these they reply. 1. *Those same Ceremonies, because the same, which the heathen used, were not forbidden the Jewes. But, these things* (saith M. *Hooker*) *are not indifferent being used as signes of immoderate, and hopelesse lamentation, for the dead, and in effect, it is that which* Paul *saith*, 1. Thess.4 13. *Sorrow not, as they doe, which have no hope.* as *Deut.*14.1. *Yee are the children of the Lord your God, yee shall not cut your selves, nor make you baldnesse betweene your eyes for the dead, nor is it hence*

Ecclesiast. Policie, *l.*4. *p.*138.

hence proven (saith *Hooker*) *That God did frame his people of set purpose, unto any utter dis-similitude with either* Egyptians, *or other Nations.*

Pag 137.

The same Ceremonies in Idolaters, and in the true Church may be judged the same three wayes.

Ans. 1. *Ceremonies* may be either the same. 1. *in number.* or 2. *materially.* or 3. *formally and Theologically.* The first identitie and samenes is most proper. And whereas *Morton,* and M. *Burges,* would insinuate that *God* forbade these same Ceremonies in number, it needeth no refutation. *God* never forbade things, physically, and by way of contradiction, unpossible. The same murthering of our brother forbidden to *Cain,* the same in number, is forbidden in number, and individually to no mortall man, except the *Jewes* had had the same heads, haire, beards, browes, that the *Canaanites* had, the same (I meane) in number, this were to make the lawes of *God* a matter of laughter to men. 2. Where as *Hooker* would have *God* to forbid, not the same Ceremonies *Materially,* or *an utter dis-similitude,* but the same Ceremonies of the *Heathen,* with the signification which the *Heathen* did put on them, contrary to Scripture, as upon the cutting of their flesh, they did impose this signification, that they should *sorrow for the dead, as those that have no hope,* 1 *Thess.* 3. we see then 1. all the *Ceremonies of the Heathen,* as the cutting of the flesh, the killing of their *Children to Molech.* So they be formallized, and charactered with a signification according to the word of *God,* shall be lawfull. Put then Scripturall and lawfull significations, either of faith in *Christ* already incarnate, or of Christian conversation, as of moderate mourning for the dead, such as was in *Abraham,* who mourned for *Sarahs* death, and in our *Lord Jesus,* who wept for the death of *Lazarus*; And so the *Sacrificing* of *Bullocks, Sheep, Rams,* yea, *Circumcising and Sacrificing of children to Molech,* shall not be condemned as a complyance, and Symbolizing with the *Jewes* and *Idolaters.* Nor can any say that shedding of blood to God, and killing of men must be now forbidden, I answered before shedding of blood, with this Scripturall and lawfull signification, and as an indifferent means of the worshiping of *God,* is no other way forbidden in the first *Table,* then because it is not commanded in Scripture. But this is no forbiding

Formalists grant Conformitie with heathen and Idolators in Ceremonies clothed with a Scripturall signification.

at

at all of worship, or of new positive meanes of worship; So you 1. make it not a part of the word of *God*, and necessarie worship. 2. So it be materially indifferent, and be instamped with a lawfull and Scripturall signification, as we suppose it to be. 3. Nor doth the Word any where condemne killing of men as a worship, except that it commandeth it not as a worship, which we say, as it is a breach of the sixt Commandement, it is forbidden as man-slaughter, but not as *unlawfull worship*. But then how will *Morton* and *Burges* justifie. *Circumcision* which they say is lawfull, yet, so it have not a Jewish intention, nor any necessitie or efficacie imposed on it? it is a degree of murther, and why may not, upon the same ground, cutting the flesh for the dead, launcing of the body with knives, the Popish selfe-scourging be lawfull? Now the text signifieth no allowance at all of the rounding of the corners of the head, and the cutting of the body, and how shall *Hooker* prove that only *heathenish* and *Pagan-rounding of the haire*, and cutting of the flesh, as they betoken mourning in a hopelesse manner for the dead were forbidden, 1 *Thess.* 3. divers of the *Pagans*, amongst whom is *Phocillides* and many others taught the *resurrection of the dead*, They might then sow *their land with divers seeds, cut their flesh for the dead, yea, and observe times, be dismayed at the signes of the heaven, as the heathen.* And what ever the *Pagans* did in their worship, they might doe so *to the Lord their God*, and doe all the *judgements, ordinances, and lawes of* Egypt. Canaan, Turkie, *of* Rome *materially*, even to the falling downe before Bread, sacrificing of Beasts, cutting of the haire, *&c.* 3. What *Hooker* meaneth by a dis-similitude, with the heathen of *set purpose*, is easily knowne. *Only in things wicked and unlawfull* (saith he) *or Idolatrous, or against the law of God, we are to be dislike to the heathen*, because it is said, *Yee shall doe my judgements*, for he expressly denyeth that there was any danger of infection by reason of nearnesse to the *Egyptians*, and *Canaanites*, in these indifferent things, or that they were forbidden, because the *Pagans used them, they were unlawfull, though the Pagans had ever used them.*

Phocyllides, ἀνατέλλων ὁ φόβος ἀνθρ.

Pag. 138.

Ans. Tannerus the Jesuite saith, *tom.* 3. *in* 22. *disp* 9. *de fide, spe.*

Spe. q. 6. dub. 9. abstinendum est ab omni specie mali propter scandalum, ratio, quia scandalum tali casu oritur ex vi actionis ipsius, non aliter fere quam si mala esset, then though the *Nations heathenish rites* were not ill, yet being not necessarie to the *Jewes*, and having appearance of ill, in that they are *Characters* of the worship of strange Gods, scandall must result from the using heathenish Ceremonies, *vi actionis*, from the nature of the using of them, as if they were intrinsecally ill. 2. If it were no more but this, they were so much the worse, and more scandalous, that beside that they are intrinsecally evill, yet they are the *Statutes of Egypt* and *Canaan*, and not the *Statutes of the Lord*. So either these words must bee idly set downe, *amongst whom yee dwelt, and to which the Lord bringeth you*. Or they must adde a degree of wickednesse to the sinnes, that they were the sinnes of *Egypt*, and of *Canaan*, and so they are forbidden, both as sinnes, and also for the bare Similitude, as the words imply, for *God* will not only have them to walke in right judgements, but also in his righteous judgements, because saith hee, (*I am the Lord*) and ye shall not doe after such and such a way, *because such are the doings and wayes of Egypt, and Canaan*. *Ergo*, Though all were intrinsecally evill, that are forbidden of this kinde, they partake also of a farther degree of morall evill, in that *Egypt*, *Canaan*, and *Idolatrous Papists* doe these same things to their *Idols*.

pag. 132. l. 4. *Hooker* addeth. *Wee must be unlike to* Rome, *not only in Doctrine, but in Ceremonies and Government, and especially Government not commanded in the Word, for all is Popish, though lawfull and agreeable to the word of God, whatsoever* Rome *hath received without commandement of Gods word.*

Ans. There is not required properly a conformitie in us with *Rome* in doctrinals, as if *Rome* were our Rule, nor is the word of God properly conforme to the Protestant religion, but the Protestant religion must be conforme to the Word. Whitenesse is not properly like to *Snow* or *Milke*, but *Milke* or *Snow* are like to whitenesse. Nor have we properly a Communion with *Papists* in doctrine, they are not our patterne, nor wee theirs. 2. We do not plead for a Government in all things to be commanded

manded in the Word, but to be warranted by the Word, either according to command or promise, or morall practise, for the *Scripture* is our Rule, but 1. not in miraculous things. 2. Not in things temporarie, as Communitie of Goods. 3. Not in things Literally exponed, as *to cut off our hands and feet.* 4. Not in things of Art and Science, as to speake Latine, to *demonstrate conclusions of Astronomie.* 5. It is not properly our Rule in Circumstances, which are but naturall conveniences of time, place, and person, and such like. But it is our Rule 1. in fundamentalls of salvation. 2. In all morals of both first and second table. 3. In all institutions, and wee conceive the Government of the Church to be a proper institution, to wit, it is a supernaturall ordinance, or helpe above nature to guide the Church to a supernaturall happinesse, nor can the Church be governed by the light of nature, or by the rules of morall Philosophie, or civill prudence or humane lawes, as Cities, Common-wealths, and Kingdomes, are. 4. It is a rule in Circumstantials of worship: because some time some thing, as the *Lord, day* is both worship, and a Circumstantiall of worship; but not properly a Circumstance, in all these the *Church*, as the *Church* must stir by the *Word of God.* 3. What ever is in *Rome* in physicall or natural circumstances is not by us judged *Popish.* But what ever religious observance Symbolicall signe, new worship, such as crenging to Bread, Altars, humane Festivals, Surplice, and the like, that are neither things of nature, nor 2. things of prudence and civill policie, nor 3. Miraculous things, nor 4. Things of art and science, nor 5. meere Circumstances, and yet are added to the worship of God, not necessarie in themselves, not warranted by Precept, practice, or promise in the word of *God*, we take to be devised by the wil of men, and if by *Papists*, so much the more unlawfull, and may well be tearmed *Popish*, as *Popish* is contradistinguished from that which is sound and warranted by the Word, and that which is not thus agreeable to the Word, is repugnant thereunto, and either *Popish*, or worse, or *heathenish.*

How the Scripture is a Rule.

Church Government properly an Institution.

Hooker. *The question is, whether wee may follow* Rome *in orders, Rites and Ceremonies, wherein we doe not thinke them* 133. l. 4.

blamable, or else ought to devise others, and to have no conformitie with Rome, *no not so much as in these.*

The worship of God needeth no religious Ceremonies, but what God hath himselfe prescribed.

Ans. We never dreamed of such a Question, it is as if one should have formed such a question to debate with *Moses, Whither may we follow* Egypt *and* Canaan *in rounding the corners of our head, and cutting our flesh for the dead, in sowing our land with mingled seeds,* &c. *or ought we to devise others the like, and have no Conformitie with them, no not so much as in these?* Now *Moses* gave never leave to *Israel* to devise either these, or any other the like. The *Question* supposeth two things for granted, which are plainly false. 1. That if we may refuse *Popish Ceremonies* as scandalous, because *Papists* devised them, that therefore the worship of *God* hath need of other Symbolical and religious signes of the like nature, which we ought to devise. But the *worship of God* neither needeth these nor any *Phylactaries* of that kind. 2. It supposeth, we doe not thinke the Rites of *Rome* blamable, this is a begging of the question, for both we blame them as positive religious Rites beside, and so contrary to the Word, and because *Romish*, and so in a high degree scandalous.

Hooker, pag. 134.

Hooker. *When Reason evicteth that all such Ceremonies are not to be abolished, they answer, they doe only condemne Ceremonies unprofitable, or Ceremonies in stead whereof as good, or better may be devised, so they cannot get out of the Brjars.*

Ans. 1. Who answereth so? *Hooker* should have knowne, that if the *Testament of Christ* warrant not Ceremonies, they and all their kind are unprofitable, and to be abolished, whither they lay in the wombe of the mother of fornications, or be bastards of any other Mother. 2. Yea, we condemne all such Ceremonies, because unnecessarie, as devised by the will or lust of men, for all necessitie and usefulnesse of positive, religious, and teaching observances is from the *will of God.* And when he saith, we condemne only all unprofitable Ceremonies, *wee are not in the briars*, for he saith, his owne Ceremonies are unprofitable briars, for we condemne them as unprofitable. *Chartwright*, that godly and learned witnesse of Jesus Christ, from whom *Hooker* would bring this answer, saith, *Popish Ceremonies*

remonies are not to be used to adorne the worship, when as good or better may be established. But he meaned never that as good positive Symbolicall rites, without *the word of God*, can be lawfully devised at all, this should have been proven from *Cartwrights* words.

But (saith he) *we retaine these, because we judge them profitable, yea so good, that if we had either simply taken them cleane away, or else removed them, so as to place others in their stead, wee had done worse. But who authorized them to sit judges? the burden of proving them inconvenient lyeth on them.* 134.135.

Ans. 1. It is a proud Reply. *Wee retaine popish Ceremonies, because we judge them profitable*, where as the question is not what the Prelates (who must bee called the *Church*) judge them to be, but what they are, for it is a farre other question, *who should sit Judges* (though we can prove *Christ* never made *Prelates* at all, and so he never made them judges) and *whether the Ceremonies be profitable or not?* When *Prelates* say, we retaine *Popish Ceremonies*, because we judge them profitable, it is to say, *We judge Popish Ceremonies to be profitable, because we judge them profitable.* For we say to retaine them, is to passe a law and a judgement that they are profitable. But our argument is against their judgeing them to be profitable and against their retaining them. Might not *Pharisees* say as much? *Wee retaine the precepts and traditions of men used by our fathers, because, we judge them profitable: and who authorized Christ and his Disciples to judge the Church? the burden of proving them inconvenient, lyeth on the Disciples. Christ* said their Ceremonies were the *doctrines of men*, and so unlawfull: and the like argument bring wee against the *Ceremonies*, and so they must be unprofitable. 2. If the *Church* make, or retaine lawes beside, and without the Word, they *are under the burden of proving them to be profitable*, for they affirme, and, *affirmanti incumbit probatio*, for they ought to give another reason, of their lawes, *then we judge; We affirme*, it is Gods prerogative to say that. 3. If *Prelates should doe worse to have cleane removed these, or brought others in their place.* Then must the Prelaticall *Church* be better then the *Apostolike Church*, for they neither had

had these, nor any in their stead, except they make us see that *Peter* and *Paul* dispensed the Word and Sacraments clothed either with lineing Rochets, and crossing the aire with the Thumbe, or then they adorned Word and Sacraments, with other the like mysticall Rochets, or some merry toyes like crossing the aire with the Thumbe, and if not, they did worse then our Prelats, who raise bloody warres in three Kingdomes, for such fooleries, and for an office, which of old, for shame, had no kinred nor house, but mans law, *jus humanum*, by their owne grant. *But that* (saith *Hooker*) *wherein the Israelites might not be like to the Egyptians and Canaanites, was such as peradventure as had beene no whit lesse unlawfull, although those Nations had never been, I would know what one thing was in these nations, and is here forbidden, being indifferent in it selfe, yet forbidden only because they used it.*

138.

Ans. This is not our argument, I am not to say, the *only reason*, why the *Lord* forbade these rites, was because the *Egyptians* and *Canaanites* used them. But it is enough for our purpose, that *God* useth this reason, *Yee shall not doe so to the Lord your God.* Yee shall not doe after the doings of the Land of *Egypt*, or of the *Canaanites*, Deut. 12.30.31. *See that thou inquire not after their Gods, saying how did these Nations serve their God? even so will I doe likewise*, Levit. 18.3.4. This is enough to prove that it is a strong argument, and Gods argument to prove that a worship, that *Heathen* useth to their *Gods*, though in it owne nature indifferent, can not lawfully be given to the Lord, it wanting all warrant in Gods word, *because heathens doe so to their Gods*, and it is cleare to me, *Deut.* 12.2. *Yee shall utterly destroy all the places wherein the Nations, which ye possesse, served their Gods, upon the high Mountaines, and under every greene tree.* 3. *And you shall breake downe their Altars, and breake their Pillars, and burne their Groves with fire, and you shall hew downe the Graven Images of their Gods, and destroy the Names of them out of this place.* 4. *Yee shall not doe so to the Lord your God.* 5. *But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your Tribes, to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall yee seeke, and thither shall*

We need not say that conformitie with Idolaters was the only cause, why *God* forbade his people, heathenish rites.

you come. There is nothing more indifferent, then the place of worſhip, yet doth the Lord in theſe words *Yee ſhall not doe ſo to the Lord your God,* forbid to worſhip *God* in the place, where the *Canaanites* worſhipped their *Idols.* And this proveth our point that Rites uſed by heathen indifferent in their owne nature, as, *place, ſtone-altars, hils,* are not to be uſed, as poſitives with a new ſignification (as our Ceremonies have) *to the Lord our God,* becauſe *Heathens* have done ſo to their *Idol-Gods.* Wee know the *Lord* may have, and hath other reaſons in the depth of his unſearchable wiſdome, why he forbiddeth ſome things of their owne nature indifferent, then *becauſe heathen and wicked men doe ſo,* as he forbade the eating of the tree of knowledge, a thing in it ſelfe indifferent, not for any ſuch conformitie with wicked men. And *Hooker* yeeldeth our argument to be concludent, when he ſaith, *Notwithſtanding ſome fault undoubtedly thire is in the very reſemblance with idolaters.* Then notwithſtanding all that *Hooker* ſaith on the contrarie, our argument is good. The reſt of this ſubject is more fully and learnedly diſcuſſed by others, and therefore no more of this. Peace bee on the Iſrael of *God,* and to the moſt high Dominion and Glorie.

Amen. pag 139.

FINIS.

Abram Cowley, whom to name is enough
with men of witt and knowledge in ye world
speakes no less in favour of ye temperance
and solitude so much labored in ye proceeding
Decourse yet yt his judgment may have ye more
force wt ye reader it may be yt I should say
yt he was a man of a sweet and singularne witt
great learning and an even judgment yt
had known what cities, universities and courts
could afford and yt not only at home but in divers
nations abroad weared with ye world he broak
through all ye intanglements of it which was
hardest innumerous friendships and a
perpetuall praise and retaired to a solitary
Cottage near barnelms where is gurden was
his pleasure he is own gardiner whence is
giveth this following Doctrine of retirement
and may serve for an account how well he was
pleased in his change the first work a man
must doe to make himself capable of the good
of solitude is ye very eradicatione of lusts
for how is it possible for a man to enjoy himself
while his affections are tied to things
without himself the first ministry of
state hath not so much business in
publick as a wise man hath in privatt
if ye one hatte little leasure to be alone
ye oyst hath less leasure to be in compa
the one hath but part of ye affairs of one

L[illegible]

Mr Andrea Massa Advocati

L. 08. 14:00.